DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 754 CE 069 680

AUTHOR	Crane, Eric C.; And Others
TITLE	Perkins-JTPA Evaluation. Analysis of the Adequacy, Effectiveness, and Coordination for the Two Years Ending June 30, 1994.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota State Council on Vocational Technical Education, St. Paul.
PUB DATE	95
NOTE	94p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Employment Programs; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; State Programs; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Carl D Perkins Voc and Appl Techn Educ Act 1990; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The Minnesota State Council on Vocational Technical Education evaluated programs funded under the Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) for program years 1992 and 1993. A survey and two focus groups, one for the Twin Cities metropolitan area, and one for greater Minnesota, assessed coordination while the Council addressed the issues of adequacy and effectiveness using documents from the State Board of Technical Colleges, Minnesota Department of Education, and Minnesota Department of Economic Security. With regard to the categorical expenditure of federal monies, the State Board of Technical Colleges satisfied all provisions and achieved the purpose of the 1990 Perkins Act for the 2 years under study. A comparison of JTPA program outcomes with the federal performance standards indicated the Department of Economic Security and the 17 service delivery areas (SDAs) met or exceeded all federal standards established for JTPA for Program Years 1992 and 1993. Many SDAs were found to have exemplary programs. Survey respondents indicated coordination was occurring frequently in their local areas and the level of coordination was somewhat adequate. Common barriers to coordination, factors that enhance it, and strategies for improving it were identified. The following recommendations were made: co-location of staff and services; cross-representation on committees, task forces, and advisory boards; local plans for developing a better understanding of one another's missions, programs, and policies; and enhanced communication. (Appendixes include survey instruments, and a list of acronyms. Contains 23 references. (YLB)

****

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

****

ED 385 754

State Council on
Vocational Technical Education
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Perkins-JTPA Evaluation

Analysis of the Adequacy, Effectiveness, and Coordination For the Two Years Ending June 30, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 069 680

ROSTER

1994-95

M. James Bensen (1997)
Minneapolis, Hennepin County
Congressional District 5

Thomas J. Berkner (1996)
Lindstrom, Chisago County
Congressional District 8

Sue E. Boehland (1997)
Bertha, Todd County
Congressional District 7

Alvin T. Huff (1999)
Glencoe, McLeod County
Congressional District 2

Shelly Lee-Cleveland (1996)
Minneapolis, Hennepin County
Congressional District 5

Richard N. Lennes (1999)
Hutchinson, McLeod County
Congressional District 2

Donna M. Lorix (1998)
St. Paul, Ramsey County
Congressional District 4

Larry A. Lundblad (1999)
North Mankato, Blue Earth County
Congressional District 1

Teresa E. Nelson (1996)
Milaca, Mille Lacs County
Congressional District 8

Dale M. Neppel (1996)
East Grand Forks, Polk County
Congressional District 7

Rhoda D. Robinson (1998)
Duluth, St. Louis County
Congressional District 8

Roy W. Terwilliger (1997)
Edina, Hennepin County
Congressional District 3

Robert L. Widerski (1998)
Stillwater, Washington County
Congressional District 6

Officers

Donna M. Lorix
President

Robert L. Widerski
President-elect

Brenda M. Dillon
Executive Director

State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson Street, Suite 314, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 • TEL: 612/296-4202 • FAX: 612/297-7786

An equal opportunity/affirmative action agency

Perkins-JTPA Evaluation

Analysis of the Adequacy, Effectiveness, and Coordination For the Two Years Ending June 30, 1994

August 1995

Eric C. Crane
Duane A. Rominger
Peggy J. DeVries
Brenda M. Dillon

State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson Street, Suite 314
St. Paul, MN 55101

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education expresses its appreciation to the technical college staff, secondary vocational educators, and service delivery area staff who completed the *Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey* or participated in one of the focus groups. Data from the survey and focus groups provided the foundation for the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations in this report, and the Council is grateful for the enthusiastic cooperation of the participants.

The Council is particularly indebted to the members of the Perkins–JTPA project advisory committee. The project advisory committee guided the Council through the process of designing the survey and collecting and analyzing the data for this evaluation. Their advice and direction expanded in significant ways the insights and perspectives presented to the Council for its consideration.

The Council also wishes to express its gratitude to the staff members of the State Board of Technical Colleges, the Minnesota Department of Education and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security who participated in interviews and provided additional requested information. In particular, the Council would like to thank Ron Dreyer and Joan Woessner of the State Board of Technical Colleges; Lezlie Ingvalson, Lois Pirsig, and Martrene Wicks of the Minnesota Department of Education; and Larry Eisenstadt of the Minnesota Department of Economic Security.

The Council looks forward to ongoing cooperative efforts with the technical college administrative offices and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security. Such cooperation will ensure that vocational technical education and job training continue to meet the needs of Minnesota's workforce. This is crucial in maintaining Minnesota's competitive stance in the domestic and global marketplaces.

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education is an equal opportunity employer.

This report will be made available in an alternate format, such as large print or cassette tape, upon request.

©1995, State of Minnesota, State Council on Vocational Technical Education. All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY vii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE: The Carl D. Perkins Act 5
- Postsecondary Vocational Education 6
- Secondary Vocational Education 7
- Programs for Incarcerated Criminal Offenders 10
- Programs for Consumer and Homemaking Education 12
- Programs for Single Parents and Homemakers 13
- Programs for those with Limited English Proficiency 14
- Programs for the Elimination of Sex-Role Stereotyping 15
- Programs for the Disadvantaged 17
- Programs for the Handicapped (Students with Disabilities) 18
- Summary of Perkins Act Implementation 19

CHAPTER TWO: The Job Training Partnership Act 21
- JTPA Title II Programs in Minnesota 23
- Explanation of Terms for JTPA Program Tables 25
- JTPA Titles IIA and IIC - Adult and Youth (Basic Program) 26
- JTPA Title IIA - Older Workers Program 27
- JTPA Title IIA - 8 Percent Education Coordination Program 28
- JTPA Title IIB - Summer Youth Program 29
- JTPA Title III - Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act 30
- JTPA Title IVC - Veterans' Employment and Training Program 30
- Summary of JTPA Implementation 31

CHAPTER THREE: Coordination between Perkins and JTPA Programs 33
- Methods 33
- Findings from the Survey 37
- Findings from the Focus Groups 47
- Presentation of Findings 49

CHAPTER FOUR: Conclusions 51

CHAPTER FIVE: Recommendations 57

APPENDIX A: Perkins-JTPA Coordination Survey 63

APPENDIX B: Focus Group Questions and Prompts 67

APPENDIX C: Acronyms 69

APPENDIX D: Project Advisory Committee on the Biennial Perkins-JTPA Evaluation ... 71

APPENDIX E: Letters of Reaction to Report Recommendations 73

REFERENCES 79

TABLES

Table 1: Total of Local Technical College Budgets for FY 1993 and FY 1994 6

Table 2: Total Estimated Individuals Served by Postsecondary Vocational Education in FY 1993 and FY 1994 6

Table 3: FY 1993 Postsecondary Federal Funding Allocations—Titles I, II, and III 7

Table 4: FY 1993 Secondary Funding Allocations—Titles I, II, and III 9

Table 5: FY 1994 Postsecondary Funding Allocations—Titles I, II, and III 9

Table 6: FY 1994 Secondary Funding Allocations—Titles I, II, and III 10

Table 7: Criminal Offender Programs in FY 1993 11

Table 8: Criminal Offender Programs in FY 1994 12

Table 9: Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs for FY 1993 12

Table 10: Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs for FY 1994 12

Table 11: Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in FY 1993 13

Table 12: Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in FY 1994 14

Table 13: Limited English Proficiency Programs in FY 1993 15

Table 14: Limited English Proficiency Programs in FY 1994 15

Table 15: Programs for the Elimination of Sex-Role Stereotyping in FY 1993 16

Table 16: Programs for the Elimination of Sex-Role Stereotyping in FY 1994 17

Table 17: Programs for the Disadvantaged in FY 1993 17

Table 18: Programs for the Disadvantaged in FY 1994 18

Table 19: Programs for Students with Disabilities in FY 1993 18

Table 20: Programs for Students with Disabilities in FY 1994 19

Table 21: PY 1992 Performance Standards—IIA Programs 24

Table 22: Program Year 1993 Performance Standards—IIA and IIC Programs 24
Table 23: JTPA Title IIA Adult and Youth (Basic) Program for PY 1992 26
Table 24: JTPA Title IIA Adult (Basic) Program for PY 1993 26
Table 25: JTPA Title IIC Youth (Basic) Program for PY 1993 27
Table 26: JTPA Title IIA 3 Percent Older Workers for PY 1992 27
Table 27: JTPA Title IIA 5 Percent Older Workers for PY 1993 28
Table 28: JTPA Title IIA 8 Percent Education Coordination Program for PY 1992 28
Table 29: JTPA Title IIA 8 Percent Education Coordination Program for PY 1993 29
Table 30: JTPA Title IIB Summer Youth Program for PY 1992 29
Table 31: JTPA Title IIB Summer Youth Program for PY 1993 29
Table 32: Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act for PY 1992 30
Table 33: Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act for PY 1993 30
Table 34: JTPA Title IVC Veterans' Employment and Training Program for PY 1992 31
Table 35: JTPA Title IVC Veterans' Employment and Training Program for PY 1993 31
Table 36: Survey Return Rate 34
Table 37: Results of Question 2b on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 39
Table 38: Results of Question 3 on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 41
Table 39: Results of Question 4 on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 42
Table 40: Results of Question 5a on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 43
Table 41: Results of Question 5b on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 44

FIGURES

Figure 1: Results of Question 1 on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 36
Figure 2: Results of Question 2a on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 38
Figure 3: Results of Question 6 on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 45
Figure 4: Results of Question 7 on the Perkins–JTPA Coordination Survey 46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education is charged by the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1990 with reporting every two years on the adequacy, effectiveness, and coordination of programs funded under the Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). This report describes the results of the biennial evaluation for Fiscal Years (FY) 1993 and 1994, also called Program Years (PY) 1992 and 1993.

The project advisory committee, consisting of experts on Perkins and JTPA, recommended that the Council staff evaluate issues of adequacy and effectiveness using existing self-evaluation reports regularly submitted to governing authorities by state-level agencies responsible for the delivery of job training and vocational education. Consequently, the Council placed the primary emphasis of the biennial evaluation on the coordination of programs supported by Perkins and JTPA funds.

The Council conducted two focus groups—one for the Twin Cities metropolitan area and one for greater Minnesota—in addition to collecting data using a survey instrument, interviews, and existing documents. The survey and focus groups for this year's evaluation were dedicated to the issue of coordination, while the issues of adequacy and effectiveness were addressed by analyzing existing documents from the State Board of Technical Colleges, the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security.

Programs Supported by the Carl D. Perkins Act

This report describes the gross federal funding allocations to secondary and postsecondary vocational education for Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994. Using information from the State Board of Technical College *Performance Reports* and fiscal worksheets for the two years under review, the report describes secondary and postsecondary vocational education general programs and programs for special populations, as well as their funding and enrollment levels. Among the programs for special populations are those for incarcerated criminal offenders, consumer and homemaking education, single parents and homemakers, those with limited English proficiency, the disadvantaged and handicapped, and programs for the elimination of sex-role stereotyping.

With regard to the categorical expenditure of federal monies, the State Board of Technical Colleges—as the sole state agency with ultimate responsibility for vocational education—satisfied all of the provisions and achieved the purpose of the Carl D.

Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 for the two years under study.

Programs Supported by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

This report describes the gross federal expenditures, enrollments, and outcomes for programs funded in Minnesota under the Job Training Partnership Act for Program Years 1992 and 1993. The outcomes for Minnesota clients of JTPA programs are compared with the federal performance standards. The JTPA, which is permanently authorized, is based on four principles:

1. States and localities, rather than the federal government, have the primary responsibility for administering the program.
2. The private sector has a key role in program planning and monitoring.
3. Program funds are an investment in human capital with emphasis placed on performance measures.
4. The program emphasizes training for unsubsidized jobs—not public service employment.

An integral part of the JTPA program is the guidance local and state elected officials receive from the private sector. The private industry councils (PIC's) are formed in all Service Delivery Areas (SDA's) nationwide and are required to be chaired by representatives from business or industry. Furthermore, local business leaders must constitute the majority of PIC membership. At the state level, business representatives constitute one-third of the membership of state job training councils, the chairs of which cannot be government employees.

According to the United States Department of Labor (1995), 15 of Minnesota's 17 SDA's were in the top 75th percentile or higher for at least one of the six federal standards in PY 1992, and 10 of Minnesota's SDA's were in the top 75th percentile or higher for at least one standard in PY 1993. Furthermore, six of Minnesota's SDA's were in the top 90th percentile for at least one standard in PY 1993. In fact, one official from the Department of Labor's Office of Policy and Research described Minnesota as "one of the stars" of the nation's JTPA system.

Using annual reporting documents from the Department of Economic Security, funding and outcomes for all JTPA Programs are described. These are Adult and Youth Basic Programs, Older Worker Programs, Eight Percent Education Coordination Programs, Summer Youth Programs, Dislocated Worker Programs, and Veterans' Employment and Training Programs. The Minnesota Department of Economic Security and the 17 SDA's in Minnesota met or exceeded all federal standards established for JTPA programs for Program Years 1992 and 1993. Many of Minnesota's SDA's were found to have exemplary programs.

Coordination Between Programs Funded under Perkins and JTPA

A total of 99 surveys were mailed to a sample representing: (a) each of Minnesota's 34 technical college campuses, (b) each the state's 17 JTPA service delivery areas, and (c) secondary vocational education as represented by Minnesota's 48 Carl Perkins Basic Grant Contacts. This survey asked seven questions which attempted to determine the occurrence and extent of coordination between Perkins-funded and JTPA-funded programs, as well as the respondents' opinions on factors which serve as barriers or aids to coordination and strategies for improving future coordination. The respondents were also asked to rate themselves on their knowledge of programs in their local areas funded by the Perkins Act and the JTPA.

In addition, the Council conducted two focus groups to discuss the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs. One focus group consisted of individuals from the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The other focus group consisted of individuals from greater Minnesota. Based on input from the Perkins–JTPA project advisory committee, it was decided that each focus group should be composed of two technical college staff, two SDA staff, two secondary vocational educators, and two students. Only individuals who could directly address the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs were recruited to participate in the focus groups.

The survey respondents replied that coordination is occurring frequently in their local areas and the level of coordination is somewhat adequate. The three most common barriers to coordination identified by the survey respondents were (a) lack of resources (time, money, staff); (b) lack of understanding about the other agency's mission, programs, and procedures; and, (c) lack of communication with the other agency (in the form of reports, mailings, and newsletters).

The three most common factors that enhance coordination listed by the respondents were (a) serving on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards; (b) executing joint projects or programs (job fairs, career exploration days, career libraries); and, (c) a cooperative attitude and a willingness to coordinate. The three most common strategies for improving coordination identified by the survey respondents were (a) develop a better understanding of what the other agency does; (b) increase communications through the use of newsletters, routine mailings, reports, and notices of upcoming events; and, (c) co-location of staff and services.

While technical college staff rated themselves as having a fairly comprehensive knowledge of both Perkins and JTPA programs, Service Delivery Area (JTPA) staff rated themselves only slightly knowledgeable of Perkins Act programs, and secondary vocational administrators rated themselves only slightly knowledgeable concerning JTPA programs.

Three major themes arose from analysis of the focus group discussions. The first is that working together leads to further opportunities and desire to work together in the future. Both focus groups stressed that staff interaction could be positively increased by co-locating staff and services whenever possible. The second theme flows logically from the first. Both focus groups emphasized that the need for increased coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs would become imperative as anticipated reductions in resources (due to pending federal legislation) actually occurred.

The third theme was that interagency agreements would be valuable tools for promoting coordination only to the extent that they were developed by staff who would have to coordinate, rather than by top-level administrators. The focus group participants listed some interesting strategies for inter-agency coordination, including developing a common intake form, sharing of client assessment information (with client approval), and division of labor among agencies with respect to fulfilling clients' needs. Practical suggestions for improving coordination, even under current policies, were developed by the focus groups.

Conclusions

Based on its review of available data and the results of the survey and focus groups conducted by Council staff, the Council draws the following conclusions.

Conclusion One: Adequacy and Effectiveness

Based on the Council's analysis of documents published by the State Board of Technical Colleges, the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security, the Council finds that the state of Minnesota appears to have met and exceeded all state and federal standards and guidelines for the Perkins Act and the JTPA.

Conclusion Two: Knowledge of One Another's Programs

One necessary precondition for improvement in the coordination among secondary and postsecondary vocational and technical education staff and JTPA staff in the delivery of programs to mutual clients is knowledge and understanding of one another's missions, programs, and procedures.

Conclusion Three: Strong Interpersonal Relationships

Line staff from agencies who are expected to coordinate activities, programs, and services must be given the opportunity to develop positive strong interpersonal relationships with each other.

Conclusion Four: Resources

All agencies interested in the coordination of their programs, activities, and services must be willing to invest time and money toward promoting coordination.

Conclusion Five: A Cooperative Spirit and a Willingness to Coordinate

A cooperative spirit and a willingness to coordinate and collaborate must become part of the value systems of agencies and their staffs.

Recommendations

After careful review of the findings and conclusions of this report, the Council makes the following recommendations. As the reader considers these recommendations, it is important to remember that they are offered as possible improvements to two systems that have been found to be working quite well by both internal evaluations and in the opinion of federal agencies.

Recommendation One: Co-location of Staff and Services

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that the Governor direct the Commissioner of Economic Security, the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Chancellor of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to initiate a feasibility study on the co-location of staff and services among technical colleges, JTPA service delivery areas, and secondary schools serving the same populations.

Recommendation Two: Cross-representation on Committees, Task Forces, and Advisory Boards

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that the Governor direct the Commissioner of Economic Security, the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Chancellor of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to initiate changes in departmental policies establishing cross-representation of agency staffs on local working committees, task forces, and advisory boards.

Recommendation Three: **Local Plans for Developing a Better Understanding of One Another's Missions, Programs, and Policies**

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that the Commissioner of the Department of Economic Security and the Chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities expand the current local planning processes so that each technical college, JTPA service delivery area, and Carl Perkins Secondary Vocational Consortium creates and executes a plan for helping other agencies better understand its mission, programs, and policies.

Recommendation Four: **Enhanced Communication**

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that technical colleges, secondary vocational consortia, and service delivery areas that service the same populations include one another on their mailing lists and exchange routine mailings such as newsletters, reports, goals, work plans, and notices of upcoming events.

Recommendation Five: **Policy Suggestion for the JTPA**

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends to the U.S. Secretary of Labor that the U.S. Department of Labor study the possibility of modifying JTPA rules and regulations so that JTPA clients may choose between being assigned either to the service delivery area where they live or where they receive their training.

The Council is aware of the controversial nature of some of these recommendations (see Appendix E). The coordination of public vocational technical education and job training can be further improved through continuous study, research, and evaluation. These recommendations are clearly the result of input from professionals and their clients in the field. The Council is satisfied that these recommendations are worthy of future study and possible implementation.

INTRODUCTION

Under Title I, §112 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990, the State Council on Vocational Technical Education is charged with evaluating the adequacy, effectiveness and coordination of programs funded by the Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) (Pub. L. No. 101-392, Title I, Part B, §112, (d)(10)(A)). This evaluation is to occur at least once every two years. Based on the Council's findings, recommendations are often made to the:

1. Governor,
2. State Board of Technical Colleges,
3. State Board of Education,
4. Minnesota Department of Education,
5. Governor's Job Training Council,
6. Minnesota Department of Economic Security,
7. U.S. Secretary of Education, and
8. U.S. Secretary of Labor.

The Council has previously published Perkins–JTPA evaluations in 1987, 1989, 1991, and 1993. In preparing these reports, the Council collected data using survey instruments, interviews with experts on Perkins and/or JTPA programs, and existing documents from state agencies, including the State Board of Technical Colleges, the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security. Previous recommendations from these reports have addressed the need for:

1. joint planning activities between vocational educators and JTPA staff (1989);
2. representation of Private Industry Council (PIC) and JTPA Service Delivery Area (SDA) staff on technical college program advisory committees (1989, 1991, 1993), as well as representation of technical colleges in PIC meetings (1993);
3. joint development (by the State Board of Technical Colleges and the Governor's Job Training Council) of guidelines that identify and define exemplary forms of job training and vocational education coordination (1991, 1993); and,
4. improving the knowledge and skills of secondary vocational directors in obtaining and using both Perkins and JTPA funds (1993).

A project advisory committee, consisting of experts on Perkins and/or JTPA programs throughout the state, was formed in February 1995 (see Appendix D) in order to assist the Council in designing the collection and analysis of the data. In the opinion of many members of the project advisory committee at its first meeting on March 1, 1995, issues of adequacy and effectiveness could be easily evaluated using existing self-evaluation reports regularly submitted to governing authorities by state-level agencies responsible for the delivery of job training and vocational education. Consequently, the Council decided to place the primary emphasis of this biennial evaluation on the coordination of programs supported by Perkins and JTPA funds.

At the suggestion of the project advisory committee, the Council also conducted two focus groups—one for the Twin Cities metropolitan area and one for greater Minnesota—in addition to collecting data using a survey instrument, interviews, and existing documents. The survey and focus groups for the biennial evaluation were wholly dedicated to the issue of coordination, while the issues of adequacy and effectiveness were addressed by analyzing existing documents from the State Board of Technical Colleges, the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security.

Contents of the Report

Chapter one of this report describes the 1990 Carl D. Perkins Act, its funding patterns in Minnesota for secondary and postsecondary vocational and technical education for Fiscal Years (FY's) 1993 and 1994, and provides evidence of the adequacy and effectiveness of Carl Perkins-funded services in Minnesota taken from evaluation documents provided by the State Board of Technical Colleges (SBTC) and the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE).

Perkins-funded programs are accounted for on a fiscal year basis, which runs from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the next year. A fiscal year is named according to the year in which it ends; thus, Fiscal Year 1993 began on July 1, 1992 and ended on June 30, 1993. The convention used in JTPA programs, however, is the Program Year, which begins and ends on the same date, but is named for the year in which it starts, rather than the year in which it ends. Thus Program Year 1992, which began on July 1, 1992 and ended on June 30, 1993, is identical to Fiscal Year 1993.

Chapter two describes the Job Training Partnership Act and its amendments, the distribution of funds in Minnesota for various programs funded by the Act in Program Years (PY's) 1992 and 1993, and provides evidence of the adequacy and effectiveness of JTPA-funded programs and services in Minnesota, taken from information provided by the Minnesota Department of Economic Security and the U. S. Department of Labor.

Chapter three describes the collection and analysis of information by the Council regarding the coordination of programs and services funded by the Perkins Act and the JTPA for FY 1993 and FY 1994 (PY 1992 and PY 1993). Chapter four describes the conclusions derived from the Council's review of the information from the previous three chapters. Chapter five lists and discusses the recommendations of the Council after careful analysis of its findings and conclusions regarding the adequacy, effectiveness, and coordination of programs and services supported by the Carl Perkins Act and the JTPA for the two years under discussion.

Context of the Report

The 1995 Perkins–JTPA evaluation is framed in a context which is different from previous Perkins–JTPA evaluations. As this report is sent to press (August 1995), it is likely that, within a year, Perkins and JTPA programs will no longer exist as we now know them. A radical consolidation of federal programs supporting vocational education and job training programs appears to be imminent. Federal legislation which would initiate such a radical consolidation is currently pending in both houses of the 104th Congress (e.g., S. 143 - Kassebaum, S. 180 - Kennedy, H. R. 1045 - Goodling, H. R. 1617 - McKeon). While the final details of this consolidation are unknown at this time, it seems highly probable that Perkins and JTPA programs, as well as other federal programs, may be merged to form a single comprehensive vocational education and job training system.

At the very least, it would seem to be the intent of Congress to replace categorical funding with block grant funding. While the states may realize potential gains in efficiency under such a system of funding, with its reduced requirements for accountability and savings in administrative costs, there will likely be an attendant reduction in funding levels in federal support for vocational education and job training.

It is important that the reader of this report consider this context. While the first four chapters of this report focus on the recent past, the fifth chapter—recommendations—was developed with the future in mind. As we approach a new era of vocational education and job training, we must draw important lessons from recent policies. We must preserve our collective wisdom and design a new system that includes the strengths of the old without perpetuating the weaknesses of the systems that are replaced.

CHAPTER ONE

Implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act

The purpose of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (Perkins Act) of 1990 is:

> to make the United States more competitive in the world economy by developing more fully the academic and occupational skill of all segments of the population. This purpose will principally be achieved through concentrating resources on improving educational programs leading to academic, occupational, training, and re-training skill competencies needed to work in a technologically advanced society. (Pub. L. No. 101-392, §2)

In order to achieve the purpose of the Perkins Act, funds are distributed to the states based on specific requirements in the Act. Title I of the Act describes the proportion of the Title II basic grant that can be used by each state for funding basic programs and special programs, and for the administration and supervision of the Perkins Act. Using 1990 Census figures as a basis, the Perkins Act specifies percentages of the Title II grants to be used for programs, services, and activities to assist specific populations.

Title II, Part A, describes the required and allowable uses of funds for state-level vocational programs and leadership activities. Part C defines formulas for distributing funds to secondary or postsecondary programs in terms of percentages of special populations at institutions. Title III provides support for nine special programs. Minnesota receives funding for three of them: community-based organizations, consumer and homemaker education and services, and Tech Prep education.

The primary sections of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 are:

Title I—Vocational Education Assistance to the States
Title II—Basic State Grants for Vocational Education
Title III—Special Programs

Postsecondary Vocational Education

In the state of Minnesota, the State Board of Technical Colleges (SBTC) acts as the sole state agency for the administration of Perkins funds. *The Minnesota State Plan for Vocational Technical Education* (*State Plan*), produced by the SBTC, documents the programs offered throughout Minnesota to achieve the purposes of the Perkins Act. Tables that appear in this chapter are drawn from data in the SBTC *Performance Reports* for FY 1993 and FY 1994 as well as the SBTC *State Plans* for FY 1993, FY 1994, FY 1995, and FY 1996.

The public postsecondary vocational education system in the state of Minnesota is composed of 18 technical colleges with 34 separate campuses. In cooperation with the community colleges, state universities and colleges, and the University of Minnesota-Crookston, these institutions offer over 225 Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree programs. In total, they also offer 1,200 Certificate and Diploma programs in 230 discrete occupational areas. These activities are funded by a combination of allocations from the Minnesota State Legislature, Carl Perkins federal funds, and tuition and locally-raised funds (Table 1). The Perkins funds distributed locally are composed of a combination of Title II and Title III funds (Tables 3 & 5). Over a quarter of a million people took advantage of courses and programs offered in Minnesota's technical colleges in each of the two years under study (Table 2).

Table 1: Total of Local Technical College Budgets for FY 1993 and FY 1994

Year	State Funds	Federal Funds	Tuition and Local Funds	Total Funds (Approx.)
FY 1993	$160,000,000	$12,000,000	$65,000,000	$237,000,000
FY 1994	$165,000,000	$12,000,000	$69,000,000	$246,000,000

(Source: State Board of Technical Colleges, 1993b, 1994)

Table 2: Total Estimated Individuals Served by Postsecondary Vocational Education in FY 1993 and FY 1994

Year	Student Enrollment	Custom Services	Total Served
FY 1993	92,000	160,000	252,000
FY 1994	87,000	180,000	267,000

(Source: State Board of Technical Colleges, 1993b, 1994)

Table 3: FY 1993 Postsecondary Federal Funding Allocations Titles I, II, and III

Title	Percentage to State	Allotment	Carryover	Total
IA				
State Administration	5.0	$618,594	$111,535	$730,129
IIA				
State Programs and State Leadership	8.5	903,300	319,480	1,222,780
IIB				
Sex Equity/	3.0	324,199	35,501	359,700
Single Parent**	7.5	912,328	83,082	995,410
Criminal Offender**	1.0	150,925	28,580	179,505
IIC				
Eligible Recipients*	75.0	9,057,780	92,906	9,150,686
III				
CBO**		192,628	122,556	315,184
Consumer/Homemaking**		304,305	73,465	377,770
Tech Prep**		1,475,885	348,116	1,824,001
TOTAL TITLE I-III	100.0	$13,939,944	$1,215,221	$15,155,165

*Allocated by formula
**Allocated by request-for-proposal
(Source: State Board of Technical Colleges Worksheet for Dedicated Federal Aid FY 93)

Secondary Vocational Education

During the 1994-95 school year, there were 377 K-12 publicly operated school districts in Minnesota (Minnesota Department of Education, 1995). Most of these districts received federal support for secondary vocational education. This funding was channeled through five joint powers agreements serving 49 school districts; five secondary vocational education cooperatives serving 38 school districts; three intermediate school districts serving 32 school districts; 249 independent school districts (many also receiving some services through joint powers, secondary vocational education cooperatives, and intermediate districts); and one special education cooperative serving 32 districts (State Board of Technical Colleges, 1994).

The basic Perkins grant to eligible recipients from Title IIC (see Tables 4 and 6) was combined with state money allocated by the legislature and locally-raised funds to finance over 1,296 discrete programs in seven broad program areas:

1. Agriculture/Agribusiness and Natural Resource Occupations,
2. Marketing and Distributive Programs,
3. Health and Environmental Occupations,
4. Homemaking Occupations,

5. Service Occupations,
6. Business and Office Occupations, and
7. Trade and Industrial Occupations.

Perkins funds were also used to support programs in three general work experience areas: disadvantaged, handicapped, and career exploration. Services were provided by the 1,808 licensed secondary vocational education instructors who directly taught or provided support services to secondary vocational education students. According to figures from the 1993-94 school year, a total of 46,289 secondary students participated in secondary vocational education programs. Another 1,793 secondary students attended technical colleges through the Post Secondary Enrollment Options Program.

The secondary vocational education evaluation measures adopted by Minnesota are:

1. Participation rate,
2. Graduation rate,
3. Placement rate,
4. Employer satisfaction, and
5. Student satisfaction.

According to the *1994 Performance Report*, these measures are just now beginning to be collected at the local level and communicated to the MDE, while performance standards for these measures have not yet been developed.

Table 4: FY 1993 Secondary Funding Allocations Titles I, II, and III

Title	Percent to State	Allotment	Carryover	Total
IA				
State Administration	5.0	$136,033	$28,000	$164,654
IIA				
State Programs and State Leadershi	8.5	379,566	0	433,838
IIB				
Sex Equity /	3.0	128,577	39,544	168,121
Single Parent**	7.5	219,612	64,538	284,150
Criminal Offender**	1.0	0	0	0
IIC				
Eligible Recipients*	75.0	2,261,625	100,136	2,361,761
III				
CBO/Consumer/Homemaking**		259,224	71,496	330,720
Tech Prep**		0	0	0
TOTAL TITLES I-III	100.0	$3,384,637	$303,714	$3,743,244

*Allocated by formula **Allocated by request-for-proposal
(Source: State Board of Technical Colleges Worksheet for Dedicated Federal Aid FY 93)

Table 5: FY 1994 Postsecondary Funding Allocations Titles I, II, and III

Title	Percent to State	Allotment	Carryover	Total
IA				
State Administration	5.0	$592,718	$227,139	$819,857
IIA				
State Programs and State Leadership	8.5	838,169	412,271	1,250,440
IIB				
Sex Equity /	3.0	316,265	40,197	356,462
Single Parent**	7.5	934,943	69,404	1,004,347
Criminal Offender**	1.0	154,667	0	154,667
IIC				
Eligible Recipients*	75.0	8,411,549	37,032	8,448,581
III				
CBO/Consumer/Homemaking**		189,100	21,018	210,118
Tech Prep**		1,701,562	250,273	1,951,835
TOTAL TITLE I-III	100.0	$13,138,973	$1,057,334	$14,196,307

*Allocated by Formula **Allocated by request-for-proposal
(Source: State Board of Technical Colleges Worksheet for Dedicated Federal Aid FY 94)

Table 6: FY 1994 Secondary Funding Allocations Titles I, II, and III

Title	Percent to State	Allotment	Carryover	Total
IA State Administration	5.0	$180,615	$11,711	$192,326
IIA State Programs and State Leadership	8.5	476,496	96,966	573,462
IIB Sex Equity/	3.0	147,735	68,930	216,665
Single Parent**	7.5	225,056	49,536	274,592
Criminal Offender**	1.0	0	0	0
IIC Eligible Recipients*	75.0	3,188,439	402,804	3,591,243
III CBO/Consumer/Homemaking**		289,654	75,210	364,864
Tech Prep**		0	0	0
TOTAL TITLE I-III	100.0	$4,507,995	$705,157	$5,213,152

*Allocated by Formula
**Allocated by request-for-proposal
(Source: State Board of Technical Colleges Worksheet for Dedicated Federal Aid FY 94)

The balance of this chapter details Minnesota's accomplishments in implementing programs for special populations under Title II of the Perkins Act and comments on the state's performance. Special populations served by the Perkins Act are:

1. criminal offenders who are in correctional institutions,
2. single parents and homemakers,
3. those with limited English proficiency,
4. individuals who participate in programs designed to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping,
5. disadvantaged individuals, and
6. handicapped individuals.

Programs for Incarcerated Criminal Offenders

Criminal offenders refers to any individual who was charged with or convicted of any criminal offense. This includes a youth offender or a juvenile offender.

Incarcerated Criminal Offender Programs in FY 1993

The *Performance Report* (SBTC, 1993b) stated that funds were distributed on the basis of the following criteria at the secondary and postsecondary level:

1. functional illiteracy,
2. development of assessment procedures to assist with career/vocational planning,
3. vocational exploration which includes work sampling and other activities, and
4. development of transition procedures to assist inmates moving from incarceration to training or jobs.

In FY 1993, one percent of the total state allocation was set aside for vocational programs for criminal offenders. These monies were administered jointly by the Department of Corrections and the SBTC, as defined by law.

Postsecondary funds are distributed through a request for proposal (RFP) process and are advertised in the *State Register*. Funds distributed were used for:

1. basic skills assessment,
2. pre-vocational/remediation skills,
3. transition to career,
4. interest testing, and
5. job seeking skills.

In FY 1993 and FY 1994, 648 people benefitted from programs funded for vocational programs for criminal offenders. For Fiscal Year 1994, the State Board of Technical Colleges began to report the split of male and female students in postsecondary vocational correctional education (SBTC, 1993b; SBTC, 1994).

Table 7: Criminal Offender Programs in FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
$179,505	190	545	735

(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

Incarcerated Criminal Offender Programs in FY 1994

In FY 1993 and FY 1994, funds designated for criminal offenders were sent directly to the State Department of Corrections for use in vocational education programs in correctional facilities (SBTC, 1993b; SBTC, 1994).

Table 8: Criminal Offender Programs in FY 1994

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment Male	 Female	Total
$154,667	193	380	26	599*

*There is a discrepancy between postsecondary totals when male and female enrollment figures are compiled, according to the State Board of Technical Colleges. Therefore, the higher figure, 599, is listed rather than 557. (Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - personal communication with Joan Woessner, SBTC)

Programs for Consumer and Homemaking Education

Funds for this category are received through an RFP process, and fall into the categories of leadership, coordination, and special projects. Consumer and homemaking education is offered through hour-based, customized, on-site, and credit-based courses.

The 1993 *Performance Report* (SBTC, 1993b) discloses that 17,216 individuals took hour-based courses in these areas. Twenty-five technical college campuses received funds for local activities in consumer and homemaking education. In FY 1994, postsecondary activities centered on work and family education using the themes of work and family outreach, employee development, and pre-employment support. Five projects which included 18 college campuses were funded. Of these, 15 campuses were in economically-depressed areas and three campuses were in nondepressed areas (SBTC, 1994).

Table 9: Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs for FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
$708,490	16,358*	figure unavailable	16,358*

*Unduplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

At the secondary level, five consumer and homemaking education projects received funding in FY 1993 and FY 1994. These were all designed to address the new Minnesota graduation standards and the restructuring of Minnesota schools (SBTC, 1994).

Table 10: Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs for FY 1994

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
$673,529	42,763**	figure unavailable	42,763**

**Duplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1994)

Programs for Single Parents and Homemakers

Single parent refers to a person who was unmarried or legally separated and had a minor child or children for whom he or she had sole or joint custody. Homemaker refers to an adult who has worked primarily without remuneration to care for the home and family and as a result, has diminished marketable skills.

Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in FY 1993

Funding for the single parent/homemaker programs was awarded in a competitive request for proposal (RFP) process. The highest rated proposals were funded with available funds. The goal of these projects was to assist students to become economically self-sufficient. The following categories of projects were funded:

1. women's centers (found on 24 of the 34 campuses),
2. support services,
3. outreach and marketing,
4. special activities,
5. statewide single parent/homemaker projects, and
6. DISCOVER (a skill development option for women entering nontraditional careers).

Services at the technical colleges to single parents, displaced homemakers and single pregnant women included recruitment, registration, retention, and job placement. The following services were identified as most needed by this group:

1. qualified person(s) on campus to provide assistance;
2. a resource center where assistance and case managers could be provided; and
3. quality, affordable child care.

In FY 1993, 2,352 individuals were contacted about potential enrollment in technical colleges, and 1,381 were enrolled in postsecondary programs and courses. Placement activities assisted 592 students with job placement (SBTC, 1993b).

Table 11: Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
$1,279,560	1,015	2,404	3,419

(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in FY 94

The *Performance Report* (SBTC, 1994) provides the following facts and figures: 2,566 individuals eligible for these programs were contacted for potential enrollment in technical colleges, 1,601 were enrolled in postsecondary programs and courses, and 1,512 students were retained in the system. Placement activities assisted 625 students with job placement.

At the secondary level, there were 15 single parent, displaced homemaker and single pregnant women grants awarded. They provided services to a total of 338 Minnesota secondary high school students. Some projects paid a child care provider directly while other projects supported a child care center on-site.

Table 12: Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in FY 1994

		Postsecondary Enrollment		
Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Male	Female	Total
$1,278,939	1,018	641	4,477	6,136

(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - personal communication with Joan Woessner, SBTC)

Programs for those with Limited English Proficiency

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) refers to an individual not born in the United States, whose native tongue is not English, who came from an environment where a language other than English is dominant, or an environment which has a significant impact upon English proficiency.

Vocational technical education was provided to these students in both English and their native language. The languages provided at each technical college campus depended upon the numbers and needs of specific LEP students. Some of the services available were bilingual counseling, assessment, tutoring in math and reading, and English as a second language.

During the last two fiscal years, the State Board of Technical Colleges has worked in partnership with Northern Illinois University to implement the "Capacity Building for States Project," which has the goal of providing vocational education to LEP adults. This has been achieved through statewide in-service training and dissemination of newsletters and other materials (SBTC, 1993b; SBTC, 1994).

In 1993, LEP assessment instruments were reviewed in order to assess student standings in such areas as reading comprehension, writing, and math. The state also held three regional training sessions for regular faculty to begin LEP training (SBTC, 1993b).

In the 1993 and 1994 *State Performance Reports* on secondary vocational education programs, LEP students were counted in a separate category. They received services that were reasonable and appropriate for their needs.

Table 13: Limited English Proficiency Programs in FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
figure unavailable	508*	1,603	2,111

*Unduplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

Table 14: Limited English Proficiency Programs in FY 1994

		Postsecondary Enrollment		
Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Male	Female	Total
figure unavailable	458**	782	1,002	2,242

**Duplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - personal communication with Joan Woessner, SBTC)

Programs for the Elimination of Sex-Role Stereotyping

Vocational sex equity refers to equal educational opportunities in vocational technical education programs for individuals of both sexes and to activities to eliminate sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in all vocational education programs. A nontraditional program for a specific gender refers to programs where the participation rate for the opposite gender is over 75 percent.

Technical colleges were awarded grants to implement sex equity activities. These activities included:

1. in-service workshops for staff,
2. staff time to develop and implement sex equity services,
3. advertising to recruit individuals into nontraditional programs,
4. speakers and support groups,
5. courses such as DISCOVER, and
6. nontraditional student career development and training to eliminate sex inequities in instruction.

A number of innovative projects such as workshops and special curriculum were developed to meet the needs of nontraditional students. Through sex equity grants, 1,064 females were actively recruited for non-traditional programs in FY 1993. Of those, 470 students enrolled in nontraditional programs.

Another priority was retention of women in nontraditional courses. Curriculum review for bias was undertaken by the equity coordinator and the equity committee. In addition, occupational placement provided strong job seeking and job retention skills. In FY 1993, 235 females in nontraditional programs were placed in related nontraditional jobs (SBTC, 1993b).

According to the *Performance Report* for FY 1994 (SBTC), 1,124 students were recruited for non-traditional programs and 490 students were enrolled in these programs. In addition, 241 students completing nontraditional programs were placed in related nontraditional jobs. In FY 1994, equity coordinators or grant managers published and disseminated an equity newsletter to students, staff, and community members. It was an important source of information for those who did not have the time to attend equity events and/or who needed help with related topics. With regard to sex equity at the secondary level for FY 94, the CAMPS PROJECT in Robbinsdale School District is described in the *1994 Performance Report*. Its purpose was to familiarize students with non-traditional careers by staying in a college dorm for one week and taking part in a total immersion program.

An equity coordinator was funded on each technical college campus to implement the college's equity plan. Services provided to nontraditional students included recruitment, retention, curriculum review, staff development, and placement.

The *Performance Report* (SBTC, 1993b) indicates that fourteen grants addressing sex equity were issued to secondary school districts. Train-the-trainer workshops were offered to teach peers about equity topics. Career fairs and special career day programs were held to expose students to vocational education options. Equity coordinators reviewed curriculum to eliminate bias and worked with high school counselors to recruit young women into non-traditional programs.

Table 15: Programs for the Elimination of Sex-Role Stereotyping in FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
$527,821	1,534	9,423	10,957

(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

Table 16: Programs for the Elimination of Sex-Role Stereotyping in FY 1994

Secondary Funding	Postsecondary Funding	Total Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total Enrollment
$216,665	$356,462	$573,127	1,534	655	2,189

(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1994)

Programs for the Disadvantaged

Disadvantaged refers to individuals (other than those with disabilities) who are economically or academically disadvantaged and who require special services and assistance to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs. Supplemental support services were available for disadvantaged students at all 34 technical college campuses. Workshops were also available for staff to update their skills in assisting disadvantaged students. Supplemental services included support, counseling and other information, academic assistance, and advocacy services.

Secondary vocational programs in Minnesota have mainstreamed special needs students wherever and whenever it has been deemed reasonable and appropriate. That is, special needs students have been placed directly in existing vocational programs and given the support necessary to succeed. Students are assessed to determine their needs in achieving their vocational education goals. Support service facilitators work with vocational instructors and technical tutors to provide remedial and technical tutoring that meet the student's individual needs. Vocational evaluation is also provided to students to determine an appropriate vocational program and support services.

In FY 1993, a resource guide for transition planning for secondary students (9th-12th grades) was created. It addressed skills required by students with disabilities. It also recognized disadvantages of those interested in attending postsecondary training programs. In FY 1994, another guide, *Transition to Higher Education: A Planning Guide for Students with Disabilities*, was created.

Table 17: Programs for the Disadvantaged in FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
Figure unavailable	12,286*	21,622**	33,908

*Economically disadvantaged, unduplicated headcount
**Economically & academically disadvantaged
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

Table 18: Programs for the Disadvantaged in FY 1994

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
Figure unavailable	9,585*	12,007	21,592

*Economically disadvantaged, duplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1994)

Programs for the Handicapped (Students with Disabilities)

Handicapped, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. No. 101-336, §3, (2)), means any individual with any disability. With respect to an individual, the term disability means (a) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of such an individual, (b) a record of such an impairment, or (c) being regarded as having such an impairment.

Programs for Students with Disabilities in FY 1993

Secondary special education teachers, the Division of Rehabilitation Services, and high school counselors refer students with disabilities to technical college programs. Included in supplemental services in mainstream vocational technical education programs are: assessment, curriculum modifications, note taking for the deaf, and bilingual support.

Recruitment of students with disabilities in secondary vocational education programs in FY 1993 was based on referrals from high school counselors, parents, students, and teaching staff.

Table 19: Programs for Students with Disabilities in FY 1993

Funding	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment	Total
Figure unavailable	1,234*	- 3,425	4,659

*unduplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1993b)

Programs for Students with Disabilities in FY 1994

In addition to the transition resource guide, referenced earlier, the Minnesota Technical College System Office implemented a new supplemental services funding formula in FY 1994 that ensured support of service planning, direct instructional support, and indirect teacher support for disabled students in the technical colleges throughout Minnesota. Student services in these schools have implemented a five-part strategy to help disabled students achieve successful outcomes from their technical college experience. This strategy includes services in support of:

- transition to postsecondary education and employment,
- early identification of need for supplemental services,
- accommodations appropriate to student needs,
- partnership planning between support staff and program instructors, and
- self-advocacy training for disabled students.

Secondary students with disabilities participated heavily in work experience and career exploration programs in addition to their inclusion in secondary vocational program areas.

Table 20: Programs for Students with Disabilities in FY 1994

Funding	Total Enrollment	Secondary Enrollment	Postsecondary Enrollment
Figure unavailable	2,901*	2,988	5,889

* duplicated headcount
(Source: Secondary - facsimile transmission from Martrene Wicks, March 29, 1995; Postsecondary - SBTC, 1994)

Summary of Perkins Act Implementation

With regard to the categorical expenditure of federal monies, the State Board of Technical Colleges satisfied all of the provisions and achieved the purpose of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 for the two years under study. Funds were used to further develop academic and occupational skills of various segments of the population. This is demonstrated in the documentation of compliance in the annual state performance reports.

At both secondary and postsecondary levels, performance measures have been developed. Performance standards and measures have been applied in postsecondary vocational education to programs funded in FY 1993 and FY 1994. Such categories as enrollment, job placement, student satisfaction, industry-based accountability, and grades of special populations graduates have been used to gauge success in the technical college system.

This chapter illustrated the total local, state, and federal funding allocations for postsecondary vocational education in FY 1993 and FY 1994. The federal funds directed toward supporting secondary vocational education for the same two fiscal years were also listed, in total and by discrete titles of the 1990 Perkins Act. Services, budgets, and enrollments for programs for individuals from special populations funded under the Perkins Act were described in some detail. Specific examples of exemplary programs were given under the various program headings.

In the Council's *1993 Perkins-JTPA Evaluation*, Dillon, Feickert, Christenson, and Mercer note that:

> It is necessary, when discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the vocational technical education system in Minnesota assisted by Perkins legislation, to point out the federal-state partnership that was created by the legislation in order to deliver vocational services. The federal government has broad national goals for vocational technical education, and it uses financial incentives as well as legal mandates to influence states to pursue these goals. At the same time, the federal government encourages the state to pursue problems that are specific to its student population, workforce, and economy. The positive outcomes in Minnesota of the Perkins legislation are usually a product of a healthy federal and state fiscal partnership that provides financial support for the strong local delivery of vocational services. The inadequacies are usually a product of Perkins legislation that is insufficiently supported by federal funds. (p. 18)

Whether adequate funding will be available in the future, possibly through block grants to the states, is unknown at this time.

CHAPTER TWO

Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was enacted in 1982 (Pub. L. No. 97-300) and amended in 1992 (Pub. L. No 102-367). The JTPA is the nation's primary employment and training program for disadvantaged adults and youth. The primary purpose of the JTPA is:

> to establish programs to prepare youth and adults facing serious barriers to employment for participation in the labor force by providing job training and other services that will result in increased employment and earnings, increased educational and occupational skills, and decreased welfare dependency, thereby improving the quality of the work force and enhancing the productivity and competitiveness of the nation. (Pub L. No. 102-367, §2, 1992)

The JTPA, which is permanently authorized, is based on four principles:

1. States and localities, rather than the federal government, have the primary responsibility for administering the program.
2. The private sector has a key role in program planning and monitoring.
3. Program funds are an investment in human capital with emphasis placed on performance measures.
4. The program emphasizes training for unsubsidized jobs—not public service employment.

The JTPA is the last of ten block grants prepared by President Reagan as a part of his "New Federalism," which assigns to states and localities, rather than to the federal government, the responsibility for administering federally funded programs. The JTPA contains many references to the states in overseeing the development of training activities and the local role in implementing these activities at their level. This gives states license to develop programs that meet the specific economic and private sector needs of both the state as a whole, and within geographic zones of each state in what is known as service delivery areas (SDA's).

The second JTPA principle is to delegate job training leadership to the private sector. The JTPA assumes that local business representatives are more aware than public officials of the job training needs of their communities. It also assumes that local business representatives will have a concern for efficiency and performance in JTPA programs often found lacking under the Comprehensive Employment-Training Act (CETA) and earlier employment and training programs. An integral part of the JTPA program is the guidance local and state elected officials receive from the private sector. Private industry councils (PIC's) are formed in all SDA's nationwide and are required to be chaired by representatives from business or industry. Furthermore, local business leaders must constitute the majority of PIC membership. At the state level, business representatives constitute one-third of the membership of state job training councils, the chairs of which cannot be government employees.

The third JTPA principle is that program funds are investments in human capital that yield profit and are not expenditures with no measurable return. Increased employment and earnings and reduced welfare dependency of participants are the measures of program success. The U.S. Secretary of Labor establishes performance standards which are accepted or modified by the governor of each state.

The fourth JTPA principle is that JTPA programs emphasize placing participants in unsubsidized private sector jobs for training, rather than in public employment. The employer provides on-the-job training in a specific occupation, such as machine operator. The JTPA usually reimburses the employer for one-half of the participant's wages during the training period. The goal is for the participant to eventually secure a long-term position similar to the training position.

Minnesota received a $34,753,715 federal grant in Program Year (PY) 1992 (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994), and $37,286,312 in PY 1993 (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press), to administer all JTPA programs. These figures include state administrative costs and funds carried over from the previous year. Funds for PY 1992 breakdown as follows:

1. Title IIA programs received $18,885,055.
2. Title IIB programs received $9,254,404.
3. Title III programs received $6,497,098.
4. Title IVC programs received $117,158.

Funds for PY 1993 breakdown as follows:

1. Title IIA programs received $9,352,183.
2. Title IIB programs received $9,811,245.
3. Title IIC programs received $5,109,713.
4. Title III programs received $12,892,129.
5. Title IVC programs received $121,042.

The JTPA grant is made to the Governor, who is the primary administrator of the funds. The Governor's Job Training Council advises the Governor on the distribution of JTPA funds. The Governor's Job Training Council has 20 members who represent:

1. business and industry,
2. the Legislature,
3. local governments,
4. the labor movement,
5. community-based organizations, and
6. local education organizations.

The Minnesota Department of Economic Security is the state administrative entity for job training programs for: the disadvantaged (Titles IIA and IIC), summer youth (Title IIB), dislocated workers (Title III), and veterans (Title IVC). The Minnesota Department of Economic Security allocates funds to the 17 SDA's that oversee the local delivery of job training programs.

JTPA Title II Programs in Minnesota

Although not a requirement, most JTPA programs use vocational technical education or some related support services to assist recipients with training. The JTPA programs which most directly impact the vocational education delivery system are the Title II Adult and Youth Basic Programs. Until PY 1993, the Adult Basic Program and the Youth Basic Program were combined under Title IIA of the JTPA. As a result of the 1992 JTPA amendments, the Adult and Youth Basic Programs were separated into Titles IIA and IIC respectively beginning in PY 1993. Some of the services participants in the Title IIA and IIC programs may receive are:

1. assessment and career counseling;.
2. on-the-job training;
3. classroom training in an educational institution;
4. job search assistance and placement;
5. basic skills education;
6. work experience; and
7. support services, including child care and transportation.

Federal standards for Title IIA and IIC programs have been established by the United States Department of Labor. Four standards have been developed for adult programs, and two standards have been developed for youth programs. Tables 21 and 22 compare Minnesota's performance in Title IIA and IIC programs to these six federal standards.

Tables 21 and 22 demonstrate that Minnesota met and exceeded all federal standards for both PY 1992 and PY 1993. Furthermore, according to the United States Department of Labor (1995), 15 of Minnesota's 17 SDA's were in the top 75th percentile or higher for at least one of the six federal standards in PY 1992, and 10 of Minnesota's SDA's were in the top 75th percentile or higher for at least one standard in PY 1993.

Table 21: PY 1992 Performance Standards - IIA Programs

Adult Programs	Minnesota	Federal Standard
Follow-up Employment Rate	68.2%	57.5%
Follow-up Weekly Earnings	$277	$225
Welfare Follow-up Weekly Earnings	$281	$226
Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate	63.5%	46.7%
Youth Programs		
Youth Entered Employment Rate	60.7%	44.5%
Youth Employability Enhancement Rate	40.6%	26.7%

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 22: Program Year 1993 Performance Standards - IIA and IIC Programs

Adult Programs (IIA)	Minnesota	Federal Standard
Follow-up Employment Rate	66.7%	58.4%
Follow-up Weekly Earnings	$286	$243
Welfare Follow-up Weekly Earnings	$285	$236
Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate	64.0%	48.3%
Youth Programs (IIC)		
Youth Entered Employment Rate	58.3%	43.0%
Youth Employability Enhancement Rate	51.4%	28.9%

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

Furthermore, six of Minnesota's SDA's were in the top 90th percentile for at least one standard in PY 1993. In fact, one official from the Department of Labor's Office of Policy and Research described Minnesota as "one of the stars" of the nation's JTPA system (K. Greene, personal communications, May 10, 1995).

Specific performances worth noting were achieved by three of Minnesota's SDA's: the Rural Minnesota Concentrated Employment Program, Ramsey County Job Training, and the Minneapolis Employment and Training Program. The Rural Minnesota Concentrated Employment Program was the very top SDA—out of 629 in the nation—for their follow-up employment rate, and they were in the 98th percentile for their welfare follow-up employment rate. Ramsey County Job Training was in the 99th percentile for their welfare follow-up weekly earnings, and the Minneapolis Employment and Training Program was in the 98th percentile for their welfare follow-up employment rate.

Explanation of Terms for JTPA Program Tables

The remaining sections of this chapter are devoted to providing information on specific JTPA programs. Following a brief description of each program are tables for PY 1992 and PY 1993 with two columns labeled *Outcomes* (related to participant retention in the program and placement in jobs) and *Funding* (related to the dollar amount invested in the program).

The *Outcomes* section includes:

1. The number of participants enrolled during the program year.
2. The number of participants who terminated during the program year. Participants may have terminated the program for any number of reasons. They may have finished the program, they may have accepted employment, or they may have just quit.
3. The number of participants who accepted employment.
4. The percentage of participants who terminated for any reason to accept employment. This is equal to the *Number Placed* divided by *Number Terminated.*
5. The average dollar amount earned per hour by participants who accepted employment.
6. The average number of weeks of participation in the program.

The *Funding* section provides:

1. The total dollar amount invested into the program.
2. The cost per person for those actually placed on a job. This figure is equal to the *Total Expenditures* divided by *Number Placed.*
3. The combined annual income of the participants who were placed on jobs. This figure was calculated by multiplying *Average Wage at Placement* by *Number Placed* by 2,080 (number of hours worked during one year in a 40 hour per week job).

JTPA Titles IIA and IIC - Adult and Youth (Basic Program)

The adult and youth programs are the major JTPA activities and claim the greatest share of JTPA funds. They provide job training and placement assistance to adults and young people who meet income guidelines (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994). For PY 1992, the adult and youth programs were combined under Title IIA. The outcomes and funding for Title IIA programs for PY 1992 are presented in Table 23. Beginning with PY 1993, the adult and youth programs were separated into Title IIA and IIC respectively. The outcomes and funding for Title IIA and IIC programs are presented in Tables 24 and 25.

Table 23: JTPA Title IIA Adult and Youth (Basic) Program for PY 1992

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	14,075	Total Expenditures	$16,376,791
Number Terminated	8,337		
Number Placed	5,722	Cost Per Placement	$2,862
Percentage Placed	68.6%		
Average Wage at Placement	$6.73	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$80,098,845
Average Weeks Participated	39.7		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 24: JTPA Title IIA Adult (Basic) Program for PY 1993

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	7,129	Total Expenditures	$8,098,620
Number Terminated	3,961		
Number Placed	2,929	Cost Per Placement	$2,765
Percentage Placed	73.9%		
Average Wage at Placement	$7.60	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$46,301,632
Average Weeks Participated	32		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

Table 25: JTPA Title IIC Youth (Basic) Program for PY 1993

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	4,923	Total Expenditures	$5,109,713
Number Terminated	2,935		
Number Placed	1,711	Cost Per Placement	$2,986
Percentage Placed	58.3%		
Average Wage at Placement	$5.29	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$18,826,475
Average Weeks Participated	30		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

JTPA Title IIA - Older Workers Program

The Older Workers Program targets eligible participants who are 55 years of age or older and economically disadvantaged. "The intent of this program is to assure training and placement of older individuals in employment opportunities with private business concerns" (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994, p. 4).

In PY 1992 funding for the Older Workers Program was allocated through a statewide competitive RFP process. Eligible applicants included: SDA's, public agencies, and incorporated private non-profit and for-profit organizations. In PY 1993 funding for the Older Workers Program was allocated through a formula process to Minnesota's 17 SDA's.

Table 26: JTPA Title IIA 3 Percent Older Workers for PY 1992

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	457	Total Expenditures	$601,341
Number Terminated	147		
Number Placed	116	Cost Per Placement	$5,184
Percentage Placed	78.9%		
Average Wage at Placement	$6.17	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$1,488,698
Average Weeks Participated	27.8		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 27: JTPA Title IIA 5 Percent Older Workers for PY 1993

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	672	Total Expenditures	$561,059
Number Terminated	490		
Number Placed	288	Cost Per Placement	$1,948
Percentage Placed	58.8%		
Average Wage at Placement	$6.84	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$4,097,434
Average Weeks Participated	27		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

JTPA Title IIA - 8 Percent Education Coordination Program

"Eight percent of Minnesota's total JTPA grant is 'set aside' for educational services, such as remedial education, vocational education, or customized training. Funds are administered jointly by the State Board of Technical Colleges and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security. Close coordination is encouraged between schools and job training centers that work with program participants" (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994, p. 4).

Eight percent of the Title IIA grant that the state receives from the federal government is allocated for the Coordination Program. In PY 1992 this amount was allocated by formula to Minnesota's 17 SDA's. In PY 1993 a portion of this amount was allocated by formula directly to the 17 service delivery areas, and a portion was allocated through a request for proposal (RFP) process.

Table 28: JTPA Title IIA 8 Percent Education Coordination Program for PY 1992

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	1,563	Total Expenditures	$954,011
Number Terminated	982		
Number Placed	368	Cost Per Placement	$2,592
Percentage Placed	37.5%		
Average Wage at Placement	$7.13	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$5,457,587
Average Weeks Participated	40		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 29: JTPA Title IIA 8 Percent Education Coordination Program for PY 1993

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	1,510	Total Expenditures	$692,130
Number Terminated	805		
Number Placed	350	Cost Per Placement	$1,978
Percentage Placed	43.5%		
Average Wage at Placement	$7.09	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$5,161,520
Average Weeks Participated	30		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

JTPA Title IIB - Summer Youth Program

The purpose of Title IIB is to provide services to youth by enhancing basic educational skills, encouraging school completion or enrollment in supplementary or alternative school programs; to provide eligible youth with exposure to the world of work; and to enhance the citizenship skills of youth. The Title IIB grant that the state receives from the federal government is allocated by formula to the 17 SDA's for services in the Summer Youth Program (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994).

Table 30: JTPA Title IIB Summer Youth Program for PY 1992*

Number Enrolled	7,689
Total Expenditures	$9,254,404
Cost Per Enrollment	$1,204

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 31: JTPA Title IIB Summer Youth Program for PY 1993*

Number Enrolled	7,689
Total Expenditures	$9,443,877
Cost Per Enrollment	$1,228

* The format for Tables 30 and 31 has been changed to reflect the nature of the program, which is to help youth learn job skills during the summer months.

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

JTPA Title III - Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act

The Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act serves individuals dislocated from long-held jobs because of factors such as changes in technology, consumption and competition. Unlike JTPA Titles IIA, IIB, and IIC, which have 17 SDA's, the Title III dislocated worker program has 11 sub-state area grantees. Resources for program activities are allocated by formula. In addition, resources are available to community-based organizations for large dislocations on a case-by-case basis.

Table 32: Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act for PY 1992

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	5,243	Total Expenditures	$6,497,098
Number Terminated	2,899		
Number Placed	2,096	Cost Per Placement	$3,100
Percentage Placed	72.3%		
Average Wage at Placement	$10.54	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$45,951,027
Average Weeks Participated	38.7		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 33: Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Act for PY 1993

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	5,879	Total Expenditures	$12,892,129
Number Terminated	4,730		
Number Placed	2,899	Cost Per Placement	$4,447
Percentage Placed	61.3%		
Average Wage at Placement	$11.29	Combined Annual Income of Placements	$68,077,797
Average Weeks Participated	11.6		

(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

JTPA Title IVC - Veterans' Employment and Training Program

This program helps to meet the employment and training needs of veterans who: (a) were disabled because of military service, (b) served in Vietnam, or (c) were recently separated from the service. The Department of Economic Security contracts services for this program to two local area providers (Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press).

Table 34: JTPA Title IVC Veterans' Employment and Training Program for PY 1992

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	169	Total Expenditures	$117,158
Number Terminated	139		
Number Placed	95	Cost Per Placement	$1,233
Percentage Placed	68.3%		
Average Wage at Placement	*	Combined Annual Income of Placements	*
Average Weeks Participated	*		

*Information not available
(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, 1994)

Table 35: JTPA Title IVC Veterans' Employment and Training Program for PY 1993

Outcomes		Funding	
Number Enrolled	117	Total Expenditures	$121,042
Number Terminated	97		
Number Placed	72	Cost Per Placement	$1,681
Percentage Placed	74.2%		
Average Wage at Placement	*	Combined Annual Income of Placements	*
Average Weeks Participated	*		

* Information not available
(Source: Minnesota Department of Economic Security, in press)

Summary of JTPA Implementation

The programs offered through the JTPA aim at training youth, unskilled adults, and dislocated workers for entry or re-entry into the labor force. The Minnesota Department of Economic Security is the administrative entity in Minnesota for JTPA programs. The Department of Economic Security and the 17 SDA's in Minnesota met or exceeded all federal standards established for JTPA programs, and many of Minnesota's SDA's were found to have exemplary programs.

CHAPTER THREE

Coordination Between Programs Funded Under the Perkins Act and the JTPA

Because the Perkins Act and the JTPA share many similar goals, both pieces of legislation assert that Perkins and JTPA programs should be coordinated at the local level. Unfortunately, neither the Perkins Act nor the JTPA provides specific guidelines or standards for coordination. The Perkins Act requires each state to "describe the methods proposed for the joint planning and coordination of programs carried out under this Act with programs conducted under the Job Training Partnership Act" (Pub. L. No. 101-392, Title I, Part B, §113, (b)(14)). The Job Training Partnership Act states that, "Service delivery areas shall establish appropriate linkages with other education and training programs authorized under Federal Law. Such programs shall include, where feasible, programs assisted under . . . the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act" (Pub L. No. 102-367, §265, (b)(3)).

The Council investigated the status of coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs in the state of Minnesota. The specific goals of this investigation were to:

1. Identify the extent to which coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs is occurring at the local level.
2. Identify the major barriers to coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs at the local level.
3. Identify the major factors that have served to enhance coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs at the local level.

Methods

In order to evaluate the coordination of programs funded under the Perkins Act and the JTPA, the Council collected data using both a survey instrument and focus groups. The survey instrument was developed with the assistance of the Perkins–JTPA project advisory committee. A tentative survey instrument was presented to the project advisory committee and was revised based on their suggestions. The revised survey instrument contained seven questions and consisted of a combination of open-ended questions and questions which were answered using four-point Likert-type rating scales. The revised survey instrument may be found in Appendix A.

A total of 99 surveys were mailed to a sample representing: (a) each of Minnesota's 34 technical college campuses, (b) each the state's 17 JTPA service delivery areas, and (c) secondary vocational education as represented by Minnesota's 48 Carl Perkins Basic Grant Contacts. Surveys were mailed to the presidents/directors of each of the 34 technical college campuses along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope and a cover letter requesting them to forward the survey to the person on their campus most knowledgeable about Perkins–JTPA coordination. In addition, they received a self-addressed, stamped postcard asking them to indicate who from their campus would be completing the survey. The information from these postcards eliminated the need for any further contact with the technical college presidents in order to follow up on non-respondents. A similar procedure was used with the SDA's. A survey; a self-addressed, stamped envelope; and a self-addressed, stamped postcard were mailed to each of the 17 SDA directors along with a cover letter asking them to forward the survey to the person in their SDA who is most knowledgeable about Perkins–JTPA coordination.

A slightly different procedure was used for the secondary vocational educators. Based on a recommendation from the Perkins–JTPA project advisory committee, surveys were sent directly to each of the 48 Carl Perkins Basic Grant Contacts in the state of Minnesota. These Basic Grant Contacts represent the 48 secondary Carl Perkins consortia within the state. Each of the Basic Grant Contacts received a survey; a cover letter; and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Since the surveys were sent directly to the Basic Grant Contacts, there was no need to have them complete a post card for follow up purposes.

Five days after the deadline for returning the survey, a second set of survey materials (identical to the first set except for the cover letter) was mailed to each of the non-respondents. If a post card, but no survey, was received from a technical college or SDA, then the second set of survey materials was sent directly to the person named on the post card. Beginning the day after the second deadline for returning the survey, each non-respondent was contacted once by telephone and encouraged to complete the survey. By the final cutoff date, 90 out of 99 surveys (91%) had been returned. The final return rates for each of the three sub-groups are found in Table 36.

Table 36: Survey Return Rate

Total	90 out of 99 (91%)
Technical Colleges	32 out of 34 (94%)
SDA's	13 out of 17 (76%)
Secondary Vocational Education	45 out of 48 (94%)

One SDA, which covers a large geographic area, duplicated the survey and distributed copies to its satellite offices. As a result, five surveys were returned from a single SDA. For purposes of calculating the return rate of the survey, those five responses were counted as one completed survey. For the quantitative analysis, the mean of the five surveys for each question was used as a single measure to represent that SDA. However, for the qualitative analysis, each of the five surveys was treated separately. Therefore, for the quantitative analysis a total of 13 surveys from the SDA's were analyzed, while for the qualitative analysis a total of 17 surveys from the SDA's were analyzed.

For each item on the survey containing a Likert scale, overall means and standard deviations, as well as means and standard deviations for each of the three sub-groups, were calculated. For the open-ended questions, responses were organized according to themes. The frequency of each theme was tabulated for the combined group as well as for each sub-group.

In addition to collecting data with a survey instrument, the Council conducted two focus groups to discuss the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs. One focus group consisted of individuals from the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The other focus group consisted of individuals from greater Minnesota. Based on input from the Perkins-JTPA project advisory committee, it was decided that each focus group should be comprised of two technical college staff, two SDA staff, two secondary vocational educators, and two students. Only individuals who could directly address the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs were recruited to participate in the focus groups.

Recruiting qualified students to participate in the focus groups presented a significant challenge. No students were successfully recruited for the metropolitan focus group, while three students participated in the outstate focus group. The most likely reason for this difference is that the Council had slightly over one week to recruit students for the first focus group, but more than two weeks to recruit students for the second focus group. With the exception of students, each of the focus groups contained the suggested composition of participants.

According to Krueger (1994), "Questions are the heart of the focus group interview. They may appear to be spontaneous, but they have been carefully selected and phrased in advance to elicit the maximum amount of information" (p. 53). Therefore, a set of three questions and follow-up prompts was carefully prepared by Council staff prior to the first focus group meeting. These questions and prompts may be found in Appendix B.

Each focus group meeting lasted for two hours. Both sessions were tape recorded. After the sessions, the principal investigator and a second member of the Council staff (who was in attendance at both focus group sessions) listened carefully

Figure 1: Results of Question 1 on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 1) To what **extent** is **coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs **occurring** in your local area? Circle the number corresponding to your response.

Mean=2.73 (SD=.85)

Entire Sample	1	2	↓	3	4
	not at all	seldom		frequently	very frequently
frequency distribution	8%	27%	7%	39%	19%

Mean=3.03 (SD=.81)

Technical Colleges	1	2		3↓	4
	not at all	seldom		frequently	very frequently
frequency distribution	3%	22%		44%	31%

Mean=2.60 (SD=.92)

SDA's	1	2	↓	3	4
	not at all	seldom		frequently	very frequently
frequency distribution	15%	23%		46%	15%

Mean=2.54 (SD=.79)

Secondary Vocational Education	1	2	↓	3	4
	not at all	seldom		frequently	very frequently
frequency	9%	32%	14%	34%	11%

to the tapes and created sets of notes for both sessions. The four sets of notes were analyzed, and themes which recurred in both focus groups were identified. In addition, a list of practical suggestions for improving Perkins–JTPA coordination was compiled based on best practices identified by the groups.

Findings from the Survey

The results of the survey are presented question-by-question for each of the seven questions contained on the survey. For questions which used Likert scales (questions 1, 2a, 6, and 7), the data for each question are presented graphically on a set of four Likert scales identical to the ones used in the questions. The top Likert scale of each set presents the findings for the entire sample. The second Likert scale presents the findings from the technical colleges. The third scale presents the findings for the SDA's, and the fourth scale presents the findings from secondary vocational education. The means for each sample are marked on the scales with an arrow, and the standard deviations are listed in parenthesis next to the means. The relative frequency distributions of responses are listed immediately below each scale.

For the open-ended questions (#'s 2b, 3, 4, and 5a & b), the most commonly identified themes are listed in order of decreasing frequency. Frequencies are listed for the combined group, as well as for each of the three sub-groups.

Question 1 asked recipients to describe the extent to which coordination is happening in their local areas. The data for this question are presented on the Likert scales in Figure 1. It is encouraging to note that the most common response for each sub-group was that coordination is happening "frequently" in their local areas. Indeed, data from the focus groups confirmed that many positive things are happening within the state of Minnesota regarding Perkins–JTPA coordination. Technical college staff perceive coordination as happening more frequently than do either the SDA staff or the secondary vocational educators. This is reflected in both the frequency distributions and the means for question 1.

Question 2a asked recipients to determine if the current level of coordination in their local areas is adequate. The data for this item are presented on the Likert scales in Figure 2. The most common response for each sub-group was that the current level of coordination is "somewhat adequate." Secondary vocational educators perceive the current levels of coordination as being less adequate than do either the technical college staff or the SDA staff. Once again, this is clearly reflected in both the frequency distributions and the means for question 2a. The survey and focus groups clearly indicated that secondary vocational educators perceive their programs as being ancillary to postsecondary programs with respect to JTPA funding.

Figure 2: Results of Question 2a on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 2a) Is the **current level of coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs in your local area adequate? Circle the number which best describes coordination in your local area.

Mean=2.79 (SD=.93)

Entire Sample	1	2	↓ 3		4
	very inadequate	somewhat inadequate	somewhat adequate		very adequate
frequency distribution	11%	22%	42%	1%	24%

Mean=3.02 (SD=.81)

Technical Colleges	1	2	3↓		4
	very inadequate	somewhat inadequate	somewhat adequate		very adequate
frequency distribution	3%	23%	42%	3%	29%

Mean=3.00 (SD=1.04)

SDA's	1	2	↓	4
	very inadequate	somewhat inadequate	somewhat adequate	very adequate
frequency distribution	15%	8%	38%	38%

Mean=2.58 (SD=.93)

Secondary Vocational Education	1	2	↓ 3	4
	very inadequate	somewhat inadequate	somewhat adequate	very adequate

Table 37: Results of Question 2b on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 2b) Please explain your response.

	Entire Sample	Technical Colleges	SDA's	Secondary Voc. Ed.
1. Participation on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards	9	2	3	4
2. Working together on joint projects and programs enhances coordination	8	1	1	6
3. There is a need for more communication	7	2	0	5
4. Lack of resources inhibits coordination (time, money, staff)	6	2	0	4
5. Coordination works very well in our area	6	3	3	0
6. Coordination happens occasionally, but it could be better	6	0	1	5
7. Lack of understanding of how the other agency works inhibits coordination	5	1	2	2
8. Coordination is not happening at all	5	0	2	3
9. Co-location of staff and services	4	4	0	0
10. Regular meetings enhance coordination	4	2	0	2
11. We coordinate by virtue of the fact that we serve the same clients	4	2	1	1
12. The two-way referral process enhances coordination	4	1	2	1

Question 2b simply asked recipients to explain their responses to question 2a. No other guidelines were provided for this question. The 12 most commonly identified themes from question 2b may be found in Table 37. Some recipients responded to this item by simply summarizing what coordination is like in their area. For instance, six people responded by saying that coordination is working very well; six people responded by saying that coordination happens occasionally, but could be better; and five people responded by saying that coordination is not happening at all.

Others responded to question 2b by summarizing the key barriers and enhancers to coordination in their areas. The three barriers listed as themes for question 2b (themes 3, 6, and 7) were also listed as the top three themes for question 3. (Question 3 asked recipients to describe three barriers to coordination in their local areas.) Likewise, the six enhancers listed as themes for question 2b (themes 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, and 12) also appeared as themes for question 4. (Question 4 asked recipients to describe three factors that have served to enhance coordination in their local areas.) These barriers and enhancers will be explained in greater detail in the paragraphs describing the responses to questions 3 and 4. The extent to which the themes for question 2b overlap with the themes for questions 3 and 4 increases the researchers' confidence that these themes capture the reactions of the survey respondents.

It should be noted that several respondents listed more than one item in response to question 2b while others listed none. In cases where recipients listed more than one item, each item was treated separately. Consequently, some recipients contributed to the tallies of more than one theme.

Question 3 asked recipients to describe three barriers to coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs in their local areas, but not everyone who completed the survey listed a total of three barriers. The 15 most commonly identified themes from question 3 may be found in Table 38. In addition to describing the barriers, recipients were asked to rate the magnitude of each barrier on a four-point Likert scale—with one being "almost insignificant," and four being "extremely significant." The means for these magnitude ratings may be found in the last column of Table 38.

By far, the most commonly identified barrier to coordination was *lack of resources*. The specific resources most commonly mentioned on the survey were shortages of time, money, and staff. In the wake of constantly diminishing resources it is helpful to realize that one of the primary reasons that Perkins and JTPA staff do not coordinate is because they simply do not have the time or the money to do everything they are being asked to do.

The second most commonly identified barrier to coordination was *a lack of understanding about the other agency's mission, programs, and procedures*. In many cases staff are not coordinating simply because they are unaware of the opportunities and benefits of coordination. It should be noted that while this barrier was identified less frequently than lack of resources, its magnitude rating was significantly higher. While it is difficult to create an intervention to change the status of diminishing resources, relatively simple and cost effective educational interventions could be designed for developing a better understanding of one another's agencies.

Question 4 asked recipients to describe three factors that have served to enhance coordination in their local areas. As with question 3, recipients were asked to rate the magnitude of each factor on a four-point Likert scale, but not all respondents

Table 38: Results of Question 3 on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 3) Describe **three barriers to coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs in your local area.

		Entire Sample	Technical Colleges	SDA's	Secondary Voc. Ed.	Magnitude Rating
1.	Lack of resources (time, money, staff)	41	18	5	18	2.78
2.	Lack of understanding about the other agency's mission, programs, and procedures	26	8	5	13	3.08
3.	Lack of communication (reports, mailings, newsletters)	19	6	3	10	2.89
4.	Different rules and regulations (i.e., eligibility) render programs incompatible	18	4	3	11	2.41
5.	Turf battles (uncooperative attitude, win/lose battles)	14	1	3	10	2.64
6.	Geographic separation (facilities, staff)	10	5	4	1	2.20
7.	We have too many people with whom to coordinate	6	1	2	3	2.83
8.	Lack of stability (too much change, future uncertain)	6	2	0	4	3.33
9.	Rules and regulations don't provide the flexibility needed for coordination	6	4	0	2	3.00
10.	Different goals and missions	5	0	2	3	3.20
11.	Redundant assessment and counseling	5	5	0	0	2.20
12.	Not meeting together regularly	4	3	0	1	1.50
13.	Lack of leadership	4	1	0	3	3.00
14.	Lack of incentive to coordinate	3	1	0	2	3.33
15.	Excessive paperwork	3	1	0	2	2.67

described a total of three enhancers. The 15 most commonly identified themes from question 4, and their magnitude ratings, may be found in Table 39. The most commonly identified enhancing factor was *serving on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards*. By far, the specific committees mentioned

Table 39: Results of Question 4 on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 4) Describe **three factors** that have served to **enhance coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs in your local area.

	Entire Sample	Technical Colleges	SDA's	Secondary Voc. Ed.	Magnitude Rating
1. Serving on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards	35	14	5	16	3.15
2. Joint projects or programs (job fairs, career exploration days, career library)	21	7	1	13	3.35
3. Cooperative attitude and a willingness to coordinate	18	5	3	10	3.50
4. Co-location of staff and services	15	13	0	2	3.53
5. Strong interpersonal relationships between staff	13	3	1	9	3.25
6. We coordinate simply by virtue of the fact that we share the same clients	13	9	2	2	3.46
7. Regularly scheduled meetings between agencies to exchange information	9	3	1	5	3.22
8. Good communications (newsletters, reports, mailings, staff directories)	8	1	1	6	3.25
9. Good understanding of the mission, programs, and processes of the other agency	6	2	2	2	3.33
10. Mutual trust and respect	6	5	0	1	4.00
11. Accountability to coordination mandates	6	1	0	5	3.17
12. Frequent visits by SDA staff to the technical college campus	5	5	0	0	3.20
13. Two-way referral process	5	1	3	1	3.60

most frequently by respondents were Community Transition Interagency Committees (CTIC's). CTIC's are designed to coordinate community-level services for people with disabilities (Institute on Community Integration, 1994). CTIC's are administered by the Minnesota Department of Education, but bring together staff from numerous agencies which serve people with disabilities. Perhaps one of the reasons that CTIC's have been so effective in enhancing Perkins–JTPA coordination is that they bring agency staff together in a neutral environment to discuss the needs of their mutual clients.

Table 40: Results of Question 5a on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 5a) Please describe what you would do if you could make **one change to improve the coordination** of Perkins and JTPA programs.

		Entire Sample	Technical Colleges	SDA's	Secondary Voc. Ed.
1.	Develop a better understanding of what the other agency does	13	2	6	5
2.	Increased communication (newsletters, routine mailings, reports, work plans, notices of upcoming events)	13	1	4	8
3.	Co-location of staff and services	12	9	0	3
4.	Regularly scheduled meetings to exchange information	12	3	1	8
5.	Joint planning (i.e., annual and biennial work plans)	9	4	0	5
6.	Relax rules and regulations to promote greater flexibility (i.e., eligibility, required programs)	6	3	0	3
7.	Joint projects and programs	6	2	0	4
8.	Maintain or increase funding	4	1	0	3
9.	Serve on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards	3	1	1	1
10.	Combine Perkins and JTPA programs together to form a single program	3	1	0	2

Question 5a asked recipients to describe what they would do if they could make one change to improve the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs. The 10 most commonly identified themes for question 5a may be found in Table 40. There is extensive overlap between the themes identified for this question and themes identified for questions 2b, 3, and 4. Once again, this overlap serves to enhance the Council's confidence that these themes capture the reactions of the survey respondents.

Two themes tied for being the most commonly identified theme for question 5a. They were: *developing a better understanding of what the other agency does*, and *increased communication*. Specific suggestions regarding developing a better understanding

Table 41: Results of Question 5b on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 5b) What would be the consequences of not implementing the suggestion made in question 5a.

		Entire Sample	Technical Colleges	SDA's	Secondary Voc. Ed.
1.	Things would stay the same way as they are now	15	4	2	9
2.	Unnecessary duplication of services, resulting in wasted resources	13	7	4	2
3.	We will fail to reach people who are qualified for our programs	10	4	2	4
4.	Poor communication between agencies	5	1	1	3
5.	Clients would not receive all of the benefits they are qualified for	5	2	1	2
6.	Clients would receive a lower quality of service	5	2	1	2
7.	Less successful clients	4	0	0	4
8.	If this suggestion is not implemented we will simply find some other way to survive	4	2	0	2
9.	Continued lack of understanding of how the other agency works	3	0	1	2
10.	Perpetuation of outdated and irrelevant programs	3	0	1	2

of what the other agency does included conducting workshops or seminars on how the other agency works, and conducting regular meetings to share information. Specific suggestions regarding increased communication included sharing information electronically via the Internet or electronic mail, and sending routine mailings to one another such as: newsletters, reports, work plans, and notices of upcoming events.

Co-location of staff and services and *regularly scheduled meetings to exchange information* were tied for the third most commonly identified themes for question 5a. Several respondents specifically suggested having office space available for JTPA staff on technical colleges campuses. It was also suggested that Minnesota Workforce Centers be housed on technical college campuses.

Figure 3: Results of Question 6 on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 6) Rate your **overall knowledge** of programs funded by the **Perkins Act** in your local area.

Mean=3.36 (SD=.78)

Entire Sample	1	2	3 ↓		4
	not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable		very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	2%	12%	31%	2%	52%

Mean=3.53 (SD=.61)

Technical Colleges	1	2	3	↓	4
	not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable		very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	0%	6%	34%		60%

Mean=2.43 (SD=.73)

SDA's	1	2 ↓	3	4
	not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable	very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	8%	46%	38%	8%

Mean=3.51 (SD=.71)

Secondary Vocational Education	1	2	3	↓	4
	not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable		very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	2%	7%	27%	4%	60%

Figure 4: Results of Question 7 on the Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

Question 7) Rate your **overall knowledge** of programs funded by **JTPA** in your local area.

Mean=2.92 (SD=.86)

Entire Sample	1		2		↓ 3		4
	not at all knowledgeable		slightly knowledgeable		moderately knowledgeable		very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	4%	1%	26%	1%	39%	1%	28%

Mean=3.09 (SD=.68)

Technical Colleges	1	2	3↓	4
	not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable	very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	0%	19%	53%	28%

Mean=3.85 (SD=.36)

SDA's	1	2	3	↓ 4
	not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable	very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	0%	0%	15%	85%

Mean=2.52 (SD=.82)

Secondary Vocational Education	1		2 ↓		3		4
	not at all knowledgeable		slightly knowledgeable		moderately knowledgeable		very knowledgeable
frequency distribution	9%	2%	38%	2%	36%	2%	11%

Question 5b asked respondents to explain the consequences of not implementing the changes they suggested for question 5a. Not everyone who responded to question 5a also responded to question 5b. The most commonly identified themes for question 5b may be found in Table 41.

Question 6 asked recipients to rate their knowledge of programs funded by the Perkins Act, and question 7 asked recipients to rate their knowledge of programs funded by the JTPA. The data for these questions are presented on the Likert scales in Figures 3 and 4. It comes as no surprise that technical college staff and secondary vocational educators rated themselves highly regarding their knowledge of programs funded by the Perkins Act, and SDA staff rated themselves highly regarding their knowledge of programs funded by the JTPA. The lowest ratings for these two questions were for SDA staff's knowledge of programs funded by the Perkins Act, and secondary vocational educator's knowledge of programs funded by the JTPA. Technical college staff rated their knowledge of programs funded by the JTPA consistently higher than did the secondary vocational educators. This confirms the notion that secondary vocational educators perceive themselves as less connected with the JTPA than their postsecondary counterparts.

Findings from the Focus Groups

There were several notable differences between the metro area focus group and the greater Minnesota focus group. First of all, the greater Minnesota focus group had three students in attendance. The metro area focus group had none. Secondly, the greater Minnesota focus group was more positive and upbeat about the status of Perkins–JTPA coordination than was the metro focus group. Participants of the greater Minnesota focus group felt that, in general, Perkins and JTPA programs are better coordinated in the rural areas than they are in the Twin Cities. They attributed this difference to the slower pace of life in the rural areas, and the fact that, in the metro area, there are many more people and programs with whom staff are expected to coordinate. In spite of these differences, there were three major themes which recurred across both focus groups.

The first theme is that one of the biggest keys to coordination is simply getting staff together in the same room with one another. With respect to the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs, there seems to be no substitute for Perkins and JTPA staffs developing strong interpersonal relationships through face-to-face interaction. Both focus groups stressed that one way to increase staff interaction is by co-locating staff and services whenever possible. The type of co-location most frequently discussed was co-locating SDA staff on the technical college campuses. It is ideal if SDA staff can be assigned permanent office space on the technical college campuses, but in cases where this is not tenable, it was suggested that an open office be set aside for agency counselors to use on a rotating basis.

Both focus groups also suggested that another excellent way to increase staff interaction is by having staff serve on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards. It was also mentioned that the focus groups themselves provided staff with a much needed opportunity to meet with one another and discuss coordination. Hence the focus groups served not only as data collection tools, they also acted as interventions for enhancing coordination.

The second theme is that, as resources diminish, the need for coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs increases. Both focus groups stressed that coordination is becoming a matter of survival for both Perkins and JTPA staff. Turf battles need to be replaced with an attitude that coordination results in a win/win situation for both Perkins and JTPA programs. This theme is difficult to reconcile with the fact that on the survey, the most frequently mentioned barrier to coordination was lack of resources. On the one hand, lack of resources makes coordination more difficult. On the other hand, lack of resources leads to an increased need for coordination. Perhaps the key to reconciling these apparently contradictory themes is shifting our thinking so that we view coordination as a win/win situation through which both parties benefit. Although coordination may require a substantial investment of resources, the eventual rewards will very likely outweigh the initial costs.

The third theme is that interagency agreements are valuable tools for promoting coordination, but they need to be developed by the staff who work most closely with the students, and not by top-level administrators. The focus groups described three ways that interagency agreements could be used to enhance coordination: (1) agencies which serve the same populations could develop a common intake form, eliminating the need for students to fill out more than one intake form; (2) agencies could have students sign a release form allowing agencies to share records with one another, thus eliminating the need for redundant assessment; and (3) interagency agreements could be used for division of labor, eliminating unnecessary duplication of services.

In addition to these three themes, four practical suggestions for improving coordination were discussed. These suggestions are not directly associated with any one of the themes, but because of their practical value they are worthy of discussion. The first suggestion was that JTPA counselors should have mail boxes on the technical college campuses. This would make it easy for them to exchange information with technical college students and staff. Secondly, a technical college staff person described how an annual interagency breakfast sponsored by his technical college has served to enhance coordination in his area. He recommended that other areas duplicate this strategy. He suggested that the breakfast include a formal program addressing coordination issues, as well as lots of time for informal networking and relationship building. The third suggestion was that JTPA staff have an opportunity to address technical college students during their student orientations. This would increase the likelihood of reaching a greater number of individuals who qualify for JTPA services. Finally, a secondary vocational educator described how his Educational Cooperative

Service Unit (ECSU) developed student-owned portfolios to overcome some of the confidentiality barriers which inhibit interagency coordination. These portfolios contain copies of the student's test scores, grades, and other confidential information. Since the students own the portfolios, they can carry them with them to an appointment with another agency and share their contents without restriction. Once again, this eliminates the need for redundant assessment. The portfolios have received widespread praise within this person's ECSU service area. The focus group participants strongly suggested that portfolios of this type be used throughout the state.

Presentation of Findings

On Wednesday, April 12, 1995, Council staff presented the information gathered from the survey and focus groups to the Perkins-JTPA project advisory committee. After the presentation of findings, the principal investigator then presented some proposed conclusions and recommendations. During the subsequent discussion, the Council staff received several forceful messages by members of the project advisory committee which were incorporated into this report and presented to the Council. These were:

1. The recommendations should be bold and proactive. The political environment surrounding consideration of job training and vocational education is so volatile that forward-thinking recommendations are important in these quickly changing times.

2. Some discussion of the current political environment existing during the life of this project should become part of the report. As this project was initiated and completed, the U.S. Congress was considering radical consolidation of vocational education and job training programs using block grants instead of categorical aid.

3. A few members of the project advisory committee objected strenuously to recommendations one and five.

Some recommendations were revised in light of the comments made at the project advisory committee meeting and the recommendations were again submitted to the project advisory committee in a survey format in early May, in lieu of a third meeting. With a few exceptions, the project advisory committee members approved the revised recommendations. The Council dealt with persistent objections to several of the recommendations by providing a forum in this report for these objections. The three letters in Appendix E are the result.

On May 24, 1995, the report was formally presented to the State Council in full session. Following the presentation of the conclusions and recommendations, the Council gave serious deliberation to the objections raised concerning the more controversial recommendations, particularly recommendations one and five. After lengthy debate, the Council approved and adopted the report, its conclusions, and its recommendations.

CHAPTER FOUR

Conclusions

Based on the guidelines established in §112 of the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1990, the Council has examined the adequacy, effectiveness, and coordination of programs funded under the Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act. Since the primary emphasis of this biennial evaluation was placed on the coordination of Perkins and JTPA programs, the majority of discussion in this chapter is focused on this issue. However, the issues of adequacy and effectiveness are addressed in general terms below.

Conclusion One: Adequacy and Effectiveness

Based on the Council's analysis of documents published by the State Board of Technical Colleges, the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Minnesota Department of Economic Security, the Council finds that the state of Minnesota appears to have met and exceeded all state and federal standards and guidelines for the Perkins Act and the JTPA.

Discussion In several SDA's, Minnesota's programs have been found to be exemplary when compared to other programs around the nation (U.S. Department of Labor, 1995). While the Council realizes that there is still much room for improvement in Minnesota's delivery systems for Perkins and JTPA programs, the Council also believes that both delivery systems are meeting the purposes for which they were established; and hence, in general terms, they currently appear to be both adequate and effective.

Conclusions Regarding Coordination

Based on data from the mailed survey and focus groups, the Council has identified four essential elements of coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs. They are:

1. knowledge of one another's programs,
2. strong interpersonal relationships between program staff,
3. resources such as time and money, and
4. a cooperative attitude and a willingness to coordinate.

Conclusion Two: Knowledge of One Another's Programs

One necessary precondition for improvement in the coordination among secondary and postsecondary vocational and technical education staff and JTPA staff in the delivery of programs to mutual clients is knowledge and understanding of one another's missions, programs, and procedures.

Discussion If staff from Perkins and JTPA programs are to coordinate, they must develop a good understanding of each others' missions, programs, and procedures. *Developing a better understanding of what the other agency does* was tied with *increased communication* as the top suggestion when recipients of the survey were asked to describe what they would do if they could make one change to improve coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs. Furthermore, *lack of understanding about the other agencies' missions, programs, and procedures* was listed by survey respondents as the second most commonly identified barrier to coordination.

Several respondents to the survey indicated that they had no idea what the other agencies do or how they operate. If secondary and postsecondary Perkins staff and JTPA staff do not understand one another's missions, programs, and procedures, it will be extraordinarily difficult for them to ascertain the many ways in which they could and should coordinate with each other. They may be unaware of duplicated services which they provide to mutual clients. They may not fully comprehend the mutual benefits of coordination, or they may view the inability of the other agency to coordinate activities at any given time as a turf-driven or capricious unwillingness, rather than an absolute barrier dictated by current policy or procedure.

The need for a better understanding of other agencies is especially acute among SDA staff and secondary vocational educators. This is evident from the data presented in Table 40 and Figures 3 and 4 (questions 5a, 6, and 7). One possible explanation for why SDA staff find it difficult to understand programs funded by the Perkins Act is because Perkins funds often comprise only a small portion of the operating budgets for the secondary and postsecondary institutions that administer Perkins programs. SDA staff may be able to describe in detail their relationship with an area school district or technical college, but have little understanding of how Perkins monies are used within those institutions. SDA's, on the other hand, usually receive the majority of their funding from JTPA money. Therefore, understanding how the JTPA operates is equivalent to understanding how one's local SDA operates.

Several specific suggestions for developing a better understanding of other agencies were offered by respondents to the survey and by participants in the focus groups. The most common suggestion was to conduct workshops or seminars explaining how each agency works. It would be ideal if staff from technical colleges, SDA's, and secondary vocational education could each present seminars to their local counterparts. In addition to disseminating information, this approach would help staff become better acquainted. Another suggestion was to conduct regular meetings between agencies to exchange information. Seminars and workshops could be used to convey the basics, while regular meetings could be used to provide on-going information. One specific suggestion for such a meeting format was regularly scheduled interagency breakfasts. This format has the added benefit of offering opportunities for social and professional interaction.

Another way to develop a better understanding of what another agency does is by increasing communication between agencies. The need for increased communication was one of the predominant themes which ran throughout the survey and focus groups. Respondents to the survey suggested that—at the very least—agencies should exchange routine mailings such as newsletters, reports, goals, workplans, and notices of upcoming events.

Although not mentioned specifically on the survey or in the focus groups, two additional ways for developing a better understanding of what the other agency does might be: (a) having agencies conduct periodic open houses to familiarize staff from other agencies with how they operate on a day-to-day basis, and (b) providing job shadowing experiences enabling staff across agencies to observe one another in their routine work environments.

Conclusion Three: Strong Interpersonal Relationships

Line staff from agencies who are expected to coordinate activities, programs, and services must be given the opportunity to develop positive strong interpersonal relationships with each other.

Discussion Knowledge alone is not sufficient to ensure coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs. The second essential element of coordination is that Perkins and JTPA staffs must develop strong interpersonal relationships with one another. As staff become better acquainted, they will be more likely to contact one another for advice or assistance, and they will be more likely to initiate collaboration on projects or programs.

The survey and focus groups revealed that the key to developing strong interpersonal relationships is to initiate regular interaction among these staff. The Council realizes that getting staff to interact with one another will not necessarily ensure that strong interpersonal relationships will develop; but conversely, the Council realizes that without personal interaction, relationships will never develop.

Several of the most dominant themes found throughout the survey and focus groups were related to this notion of getting staff to interact with one another. For instance, the top theme for both question 2b (explain the level of adequacy of coordination in your local area) and question 4 (describe three factors that serve to enhance coordination in your local area) was *participation on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards*. The second most common themes for question 2b and question 4 were also identical, and were also related to the notion of staff interacting with one another. This theme was *working on joint projects and programs*. Another dominant theme found on the survey and in the focus groups was *co-location of staff and services*. Co-location was identified as a theme for three of the five open-ended questions on the survey.

Several of the suggestions offered in the previous section for developing a better understanding of what the other agency does would also provide valuable opportunities for interaction between agency staffs. Among these suggestions would be: regular meetings between agencies, regularly scheduled interagency breakfasts, and open houses. Of course, any increased communication would also serve to strengthen relationships between agency staffs.

In addition to providing ideas for strengthening interpersonal relationships between staff, the survey data also provided insight into some of the major barriers to developing interpersonal relationships between staff. One barrier is that staff have too many people with whom they need to coordinate. Another barrier is geographic separation. Both of these barriers are demonstrated by the reality that some SDA's in Minnesota send clients to as many as six or eight technical colleges outside their SDA.

Conclusion Four: Resources

All agencies interested in the coordination of their programs, activities, and services must be willing to invest time and money toward promoting coordination.

Discussion If staff are to coordinate, resources must be set aside for such activities. Coordination often requires a financial investment, but more importantly, staff must be given time to coordinate. Lack of resources was, by far, the most commonly identified barrier to coordination on the survey (see Table 38). As a result of diminishing resources, staff are constantly being asked to do more with less. They are struggling to find time to complete even the most fundamental tasks already assigned to them. Coordination is often perceived as an important, but non-essential, component of their duties. Hence, even sincere aspirations for coordination are never quite realized.

Data from the focus groups was helpful for interpreting the data from the survey about lack of resources. Discussions in the focus groups revealed that, in addition to being a barrier to coordination, diminishing resources provides an important incentive to coordinate. Both focus groups stressed that, in the wake of diminishing resources, coordination is becoming a matter of survival. Agencies are being forced to pool their resources. Eliminating unnecessary duplication of services is no longer optional. It is essential. Coordination does require an investment of time and money, but it's an investment that has the potential of reaping large dividends.

While it is ultimately the line staff who must organize for real coordination to occur, the willingness of managers of all agencies involved to target funds and time for such activities sends a very strong message to all employees that coordination is a highly valued activity at the administrative level. Taking the time and other resources to teach agency staffs to coordinate represents a long-term investment with a substantial potential return to the agencies and their customers. The extent to which administrators continue to support coordination in the face of early efforts may be the deciding factor in determining whether line staff continue to explore the full range of collaborative activities for the mutual benefit of their agencies, as well as their clients.

One of the lessons derived by the McKnight Foundation during an evaluation of its Families in Poverty Program bears repeating here.

> Collaboration has an impact on the collaborators. It can contribute in important ways to the effectiveness of programs, but it is difficult and time-consuming. It can have powerful effects, both positive and negative. Costs, benefits and commitments should be carefully assessed and monitored in undertaking collaborative efforts. The criterion for deciding if it is worth pursuing is whether it will make a difference to, really contribute to, program effectiveness, i.e., will all the effort result in better outcomes for [clients]?
> (Patton, Bringewatt, Campbell, Dewar, & Mueller, 1993, p. 39)

Conclusion Five: A Cooperative Spirit and a Willingness to Coordinate

A cooperative spirit and a willingness to coordinate and collaborate must become part of the value systems of agencies and their staffs.

Discussion The final essential element of coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs is a cooperative spirit and a willingness to coordinate. Turf battles need to be replaced with an understanding that coordination is a win/win situation where all parties, specifically clients, benefit. *A cooperative attitude and a willingness to coordinate* was listed as the third most common factor for enhancing coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs. Conversely, *turf battles* was listed as the fifth most common barrier to coordination.

While the survey indicated that a cooperative attitude is essential for coordination, neither the survey nor the focus groups provided much insight into how this type of attitude could be developed. The fact is that attitudes can be difficult to change. However, research from the fields of management and human resource development indicates that attitudes in the workplace often originate with top management and trickle down through the ranks (Beer & Walton, 1989). Top level administrators in the technical colleges, SDA's, and secondary vocational education need to demonstrate a clear and positive attitude about coordination and be very careful to avoid any endorsement of turf battles.

CHAPTER FIVE

Recommendations

This chapter presents a set of recommendations for improving coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs. These recommendations represent practical applications of the conclusions presented in the previous chapter. As the reader considers these recommendations, it is important to remember that they are offered as possible improvements to two systems that have been found to be working quite well, by both internal evaluations and in the opinion of federal agencies.

Recommendation One: Co-location of Staff and Services

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that the Governor direct the Commissioner of Economic Security, the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to initiate a feasibility study on the co-location of staff and services among technical colleges, JTPA service delivery areas, and secondary schools serving the same populations.

Rationale In order to facilitate stronger professional relationships between Perkins and JTPA staffs and provide better services to their clients, the Council recommends that multiple agencies (e.g., technical colleges, JTPA service delivery areas, and secondary vocational programs) serving the same populations locate staff and services in the same physical location whenever possible. This recommendation is intended to initiate a search for strategies to increase client access to services, reduce duplication of services, and promote the geographic consolidation of resources—all designed to better serve clients' needs. At a minimum, the Council would like to see two changes: (1) designated office space for JTPA counselors at each technical college campus; and (2) designated office space for technical college counselors within the proposed Minnesota Workforce (one-stop) Centers.

The Council recognizes that additional office space is very difficult to come by in many technical colleges; however, the Council recommends that campus presidents at each technical college make at least one office available for counselors from other agencies—including, but not limited to, JTPA counselors—to use on a rotating basis. From the focus group participants, the Council found that several technical colleges have already designated such offices. These offices, often with a sign-up sheet on the door, are seen as successful by the customers and the staffs of the technical colleges and SDA's involved.

For many of the same reasons mentioned above, the local Workforce Councils (formerly the private industry councils) should require their service delivery areas to designate office space for technical college counselors within the proposed Minnesota Workforce Centers. The Council believes that designating office space for technical college counselors represents the absolute minimum degree of co-location which should occur between the technical colleges and service delivery areas regarding the Minnesota Workforce Centers and that greater degrees of co-location should at least be investigated.

For some service delivery areas, the best solution may be to actually co-locate an entire Minnesota Workforce Center on a technical college campus. Although heated objections to this suggestion have already been raised to the Council—including some by members of the project advisory committee—there are compelling reasons to view co-location as a viable option in some circumstances. In some locations in Minnesota, technical colleges already represent the largest delivery systems of JTPA-funded training within the service delivery area. It is not unreasonable to consider locating an agency office where many customers can already be found.

The Council realizes that this is neither a practical nor appropriate solution for every service delivery area, but in terms of ideal Perkins–JTPA coordination, full co-location represents the ultimate model. In cases where this maximum degree of co-location is not the best solution, the Council recommends that private industry councils and technical colleges investigate the possibility of co-locating satellite offices of Minnesota Workforce Centers on technical college campuses. In addition, some form of electronic co-location of Workforce Development Centers (e.g., current labor market information) or technical colleges (current program information) might prove feasible within the secondary schools.

Recommendation Two: Cross-representation on Committees, Task Forces, and Advisory Boards

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that the Governor direct the Commissioner of Economic Security, the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education, and the Chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities to initiate changes in departmental policies establishing cross-representation of agency staffs on local working committees, task forces, and advisory boards.

Rationale In order to facilitate strong professional relationships as a result of working side-by-side, the Council recommends that staff from technical colleges, secondary vocational education, and service delivery areas strive to serve on the same committees, task forces, and advisory boards whenever possible. These committees, task forces, or advisory boards could be directly connected to Perkins or JTPA programs (i.e. PIC's or Perkins Planning Committees), but they might also involve a third party, such as the Community Transition Interagency Committees (CTIC's), which have been powerful catalysts for local coordination. Information contained in this report suggests that this type of cross-representation is already occurring in many local areas, and is one of the major factors contributing to successful coordination. Therefore the Council believes that agencies should take further measures to encourage greater occurrences of cross-representation.

For instance, the Governor's Workforce Development Council might establish a requirement that each of Minnesota's 17 Private Industry Councils include at least one staff member from a technical college and at least one representative from secondary vocational education. In another example, the Chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities might establish and enforce a requirement that each of the postsecondary Perkins Planning Committees (numbering between 18 and 34) include at least one staff member from a service delivery area.

Finally, although this recommendation was a result of information gathered from local, rather than state-level administrators, the Council believes that cross-representation on working committees, task forces, and advisory boards should occur not only at the local level, but at the state-level as well. This is already occurring in the state-level CTIC and the JTPA 8 Percent Education Coordination Program.

During the first project advisory committee meeting, several members of the committee expressed their belief that a similar recommendation from the 1993 Perkins-JTPA Evaluation by the Council was merely an orphan recommendation—i.e., an anomaly which had no practical significance. Yet, identical recommendations also resulted independently from the 1989 and 1991 Council evaluations of Perkins-JTPA coordination. In 1995, through the mailed survey and focus groups, the Council learned that the importance of this aid to coordination could not be overstated, according to the people in the field. Perhaps what administrators at the agency or state level fail to appreciate is the importance—to line staff—of having line staff serve on the same local committees, task forces, and advisory boards.

Recommendation Three: Local Plans for Developing a Better Understanding of One Another's Missions, Programs, and Policies

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that the Commissioner of the Department of Economic Security and the Chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities expand the current local planning processes so that each technical college, JTPA service delivery area, and Carl Perkins Secondary Vocational

Consortium creates and executes a plan for helping other agencies better understand its mission, programs, and policies.

Rationale For technical colleges and secondary vocational consortia this plan should be included as part of their Biennial Perkins Plans. For service delivery areas this plan could be included as part of their Two-Year JTPA Plans.

Specific suggestions for these plans might include: (a) inviting coordinating agencies to a seminar or workshop which explains the host agency's mission, programs, and procedures; (b) conducting regular meetings with coordinating agencies to exchange information; (c) inviting coordinating agencies to an open house so they can see how their agency operates on a day-to-day basis; (d) sponsoring regular interagency breakfasts; or (e) providing job shadowing experiences, thus enabling staff from other agencies to observe staff from the host agency in their routine work environments.

To increase trust and mutual cooperation, agency staff also need to understand each others' policies and regulations. This knowledge can also point out where policies need to be changed to enhance, rather than inhibit, local coordination.

Recommendation Four: Enhanced Communication

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends that technical colleges, secondary vocational consortia, and service delivery areas that service the same populations include one another on their mailing lists and exchange routine mailings, such as newsletters, reports, goals, workplans, and notices of upcoming events.

Rationale This recommendation is made to facilitate better communication. The Council also suggests that the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, the Department of Education, and the Department of Economic Security collaborate to establish electronic linkages between the technical colleges, the service delivery area offices, and secondary vocational educators which would enable their staffs to share data and exchange electronic mail.

Recommendation Five: Policy Suggestion for the JTPA

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education recommends to the U.S. Secretary of Labor that the U.S. Department of Labor study the possibility of modifying JTPA rules and regulations so that JTPA clients may choose between being assigned either to the service delivery area where they live or where they receive their training.

Rationale This recommendation is made in order to reduce both geographic barriers for clients and staff, and the number of people with whom the staffs of several agencies must coordinate. The current policy requires that clients be assigned to the service delivery area where they live. This current policy requires some service delivery areas within the state to coordinate with as many as six or eight technical colleges outside of their service delivery area in addition to the two or three technical colleges that fall naturally within their service delivery areas.

Most importantly, this amendment would result in better services for JTPA clients (e.g., the students in the greater Minnesota focus group who had to travel 60-65 miles to meet with their JTPA counselors). It would also help reduce the number of people with whom technical college and SDA staff must coordinate, as well as the distances many SDA staff must now travel to meet with clients attending technical colleges outside their service delivery area. These considerations were identified by the respondents to the survey as barriers to coordination.

The Council recognizes that implementation of this recommendation, *without careful consideration of all of the possible ramifications*, has the potential for doing much harm to SDA's who currently send their customers to technical colleges that offer training matching the aptitudes and interests of their clients, regardless of the location of the college. The best possible scenario, for many SDA staff, would be that the technical college or colleges located within the service delivery area offer all possible training programs. Yet, the technical college system in this state has placed a high value on reducing unnecessary overlap and duplication of programs in an effort to reduce the possibility of mutually destructive competition. SDA staff, who have their clients' best interests in mind, are perfectly willing to pay for their clients' training expenses, without consideration of where that training is available. This must be allowed to continue.

It is not the intention of the Council that any SDA should be punished for doing what is best for its clients. If the JTPA money simply follows the client, without regard to the base operating expenses of the SDA, too many staff may be tempted to counsel clients to participate in training programs located strictly within the boundaries of the service delivery area and disregard the best interests of individuals whose best match for training may be found at a technical college outside the service delivery area. Implementation of this policy, should it occur, must be founded on the principle that no SDA should be penalized for conscientiously choosing the best course of action for the individual customer. Implementation of this recommendation without careful consideration and study might have such an adverse effect.

The Council has been informed, by several JTPA staff, that funding has been dwindling across the nation for a number of years. There is enough money in the system to serve about three to five percent of the eligible population, according to statistics provided by the Department of Economic Security Research and Statistics Unit

(Larry Eisenstadt, personal communication, June 29, 1995). Consequently, the system of services offered under the Job Training Partnership Act must, of necessity, operate on a triage model of client selection. Recognition of this reality must be accompanied by caution in system redesign.

One major barrier to implementing this recommendation is the lack of an equitable accounting system which would allow clients to receive services from an SDA different from the one where they live. Creating a new accounting system for distributing JTPA dollars is, of course, a major undertaking. However, the Council believes that the payoff for such an undertaking could yield huge benefits in the form of increased customer service. Specifying the exact form that this new accounting system should take is far beyond the scope of this report. However, this much seems obvious: The new accounting system should have a component which would remunerate SDA's for the number of clients they serve, and not simply the incidence of poverty and unemployment within the SDA. At the same time, the accounting system should somehow reward SDA's for referring their clients to services provided through other SDA's. In other words, both the sending and receiving SDA's need to be rewarded.

The Department of Labor could use the experiences of Minnesota's Open Enrollment Option for public schools as an example. The accounting demands did not prove to be insurmountable and there was not a flood of transfers. However, as with many initiatives in public policy, there have been some unintended consequences that may require fine tuning of this exciting initiative (Rubenstein, Hamar, & Adelman, 1992; Colopy & Tarr, 1994; Funkhouser & Colopy, 1994). The proposed amendments to JTPA policy would also likely need fine tuning after implementation, but appear to hold multiple advantages over the current system.

Several of these recommendations are controversial. Although the majority of the project advisory committee and the full Council approved and adopted these recommendations, a few members of the project advisory committee continue to have strenuous objections to recommendations one, two, and five. The substance of the arguments against these recommendations can be found in Appendix E.

APPENDIX A

The Perkins JTPA Coordination Survey

State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson Street, Suite 314
St. Paul, MN 55101
TEL: 612-296-4202 FAX: 612-297-7786

Perkins JTPA Coordination Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assist the State Council on Vocational Technical Education in evaluating the coordination of programs funded through the Carl D. Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Your responses are important to the State Council and critical to the outcome of this evaluation.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and **fax it to 612-297-7786 no later than April 3, 1995**, or **mail it by March 31, 1995** using the enclosed self addressed, stamped envelope. The State Council assures you that your responses will be kept completely confidential. At no time will the State Council identify participants by name; however, we ask that you include your name on the questionnaire for follow-up purposes. Thank you for participating in this important and timely evaluation!

Name______________________________ Telephone Number_____-_____-__________

Position______________________________ Organization______________________________

Please check one. I am on the staff of a:

☐ Technical College ☐ Service Delivery Area ☐ K-12 School District

1. To what **extent** is **coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs **occurring** in your local area? Circle the number corresponding to your response.

1	2	3	4
not at all	seldom	frequently	very frequently

2. a) Is the **current level of coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs in your local area adequate? Circle the number which best describes coordination in your area.

1	2	3	4
very inadequate	somewhat inadequate	somewhat adequate	very adequate

b) Please explain your response.

3. Describe **three barriers to coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs in your local area. Use the scales on the right to rate the magnitude of each barrier.

a) Barrier #1:

1	2	3	4
almost insignificant	somewhat significant	very significant	extremely significant

b) Barrier #2:

1	2	3	4
almost insignificant	somewhat significant	very significant	extremely significant

c) Barrier #3:

1	2	3	4
almost insignificant	somewhat significant	very significant	extremely significant

4. Describe **three factors** that have served to **enhance coordination** between Perkins and JTPA programs in your local area. Use the scales on the right to rate the magnitude to which each factor enhances coordination.

a) Enhancing Factor #1:

1	2	3	4
almost insignificant	somewhat significant	very significant	extremely significant

b) Enhancing Factor #2:

1	2	3	4
almost insignificant	somewhat significant	very significant	extremely significant

c) Enhancing Factor #3:

1	2	3	4
almost insignificant	somewhat significant	very significant	extremely significant

5. a) Please describe what you would do if you could make **one change to improve the coordination** of Perkins and JTPA programs.

   b) What would be the **consequences of not implementing** your suggestion?

6. Rate your **overall knowledge** of programs funded by the **Perkins Act** in your local area.

1	2	3	4
not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable	very knowledgeable

7. Rate your **overall knowledge** of programs funded by **JTPA** in your local area.

1	2	3	4
not at all knowledgeable	slightly knowledgeable	moderately knowledgeable	very knowledgeable

Thank you for your assistance! Please fax your completed questionnaire to 612-297-7786 no later than April 3, or mail it by March 31 to:

State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson Street, Suite 314
St. Paul, MN 55101

APPENDIX B

Focus Group Questions

Focus Groups to Discuss Perkins JTPA Coordination

Questions and Prompts

Introduction

> Thank you for coming.
> What is the State Council on Vocational Technical Education?
> Overview of the Perkins–JTPA evaluation.
> Purpose of the focus group.
> We will be tape recording this session, but this information will be kept totally confidential.
> Let's begin by going around the room and introducing ourselves. Please tell us your name, what you do, and your background with Perkins and/or JTPA programs.

Ground Rules

> Please direct your comments to the entire group.
> Please don't feel as if you need to limit yourself to positive comments. In fact, we may learn even more from negative comments.

Question 1: We'd like you to start off by thinking about your own institution, and other institutions in your local area. Tell us about coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs in your area. Is it happening? If it is, tell us about it. If not, tell us about the barriers that may be preventing it.

Prompts:

a. What seems to be working well to enhance coordination in your area?
b. What are some barriers to coordination?
c. Tell us about how it got started. Who initiated it?
d. Tell us about the history of coordination in your area. How has it changed over time?
e. Is coordination talked about in your institution? Have you felt compelled to coordinate?

Question 2: Both the Perkins Act and JTPA mandate coordination. Why is coordination so important? What are the consequences of not being coordinated?

Prompts:

a. Is coordination a realistic mandate?
b. Who suffers if we are not coordinated?
c. Does anyone benefit if we are not coordinated?
d. Can you think of some ways your program or others like it could benefit from being better coordinated?

Question 3: What can be done to improve coordination?

Prompts:

a. Whose job is it to initiate coordination?
b. How can we hold people accountable to being coordinated?
c. It seems that coordination needs to be defined before it can be mandated. How should we define it?

Question 4: Tell us about the one-stop career centers. How do they affect coordination? How can technical colleges and secondary vocational education get involved in them?

Prompts:

a. Can others tap into your information?
b. Will any of your career centers be housed on technical college campuses?

Question 5: Is there anything else we need to discuss about coordination that we haven't already talked about?

APPENDIX C

Acronyms

The following is a list of acronyms that were used in this report:

CBO	Community based organization.
CETA	The Comprehensive Employment Training Act — The predecessor to JTPA.
CTIC	Community Transition Interagency Committee.
ECSU	Education cooperative service unit.
EDWAA	Economic Dislocated Worker Adjustment Assistance Act.
ESL	English as a second language.
FY, PY	Fiscal year and program year — both FY and PY define a 12-month period from July 1 - June 30. However, a PY is defined by the year in which it begins, and an FY is defined by the year in which it ends. For example, PY 1990 begins on July 1, 1990 and ends on June 30, 1991, whereas FY 1990 begins on July 1, 1989 and ends on June 30, 1990.
GED	General equivalency diploma.
GJTC	Governor's Job Training Council. Required by JTPA to advise the governor on the planning and coordination of employment and training activities in the state.
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-300), amended by the Job Training Reform Amendments of 1992 (Public Law 102-367) — Focuses on job training for the economically disadvantaged.
LEP	Limited English proficiency.

MDE	Minnesota Department of Education — The governing body overseeing the state's K-12 education system.
Perkins Act	Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-392, 104 Stat. 753) — the primary law through which the federal government supports secondary and postsecondary vocational technical education.
PIC	Private Industry Council — The group of individuals within each service delivery area appointed to plan, oversee, monitor and review JTPA programs in coordination with local elected officials. The majority of PIC members are from the private sector, while others represent education, labor, rehabilitation, community based organizations, economic development organizations, and the Job Service.
PY	Program year — See FY, PY, above.
RFP	Request for proposal.
SDA	Service Delivery Area — Geographic area within which PIC's administer JTPA programs on a local level. Minnesota has 17 SDA's.
SBTC	State Board of Technical Colleges — The governing body of Minnesota's system of technical colleges until June 30, 1995. On July 1, 1995, the State Board was replaced by Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU), a new governing body which now oversees all public postsecondary education in Minnesota except the University of Minnesota.

APPENDIX D

Project Advisory Committee on the Biennial Perkins-JTPA Evaluation

Dr. Larry Barnhardt, President, St. Cloud Technical College, St. Cloud

Dr. James M. Brown, Associate Professor and Director, Minnesota Research and Development Center, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus

Ms. Mary Brunkow, Field Operations Regional Director – Metro Job Service/Re-employment Insurance, Minnesota Department of Economic Security, St. Paul

Ms. Diane Bublitz, Executive Director, Private Industry Council 5, Annandale

Mr. Mick Coleman, JTPA/Youth Apprenticeship Coordinator, State Board of Technical Colleges, St. Paul

Mr. Eric C. Crane, Research Fellow, State Council on Vocational Technical Education, St. Paul

Ms. Peggy J. DeVries, Research Fellow, State Council on Vocational Technical Education, St. Paul

Ms. Brenda M. Dillon, Executive Director, State Council on Vocational Technical Education, St. Paul

Ms. Ginnee S. Engberg, Director, Employment and Training Unit, Community Based Services Division, Minnesota Department of Economic Security, St. Paul

Dr. Charles R. Hopkins, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus

Ms. Lezlie Ingvalson, Carl Perkins Basic Grant Coordinator, Office of State and Federal Programs, Minnesota Department of Education, St. Paul

Dr. Mel Johnson, Vice Chancellor of System Improvement Services, State Board of Technical Colleges, St. Paul

Mr. James Mecklenburg, Assistant Director, Wright Technical Center, Buffalo

Mr. Bruce Nauth, Manager, JTPA Education Coordination Services, State Board of Technical Colleges, St. Paul

Mr. Thomas L. Norman, Director, Dakota County Employment and Training Center, Dakota County Technical College, Rosemount

Mr. Charles Robinson, Program Specialist, Employment and Training Unit, Community Based Services Division, Minnesota Department of Economic Security, St. Paul

Mr. Duane A. Rominger, Senior Planner, State Council on Vocational Technical Education, St. Paul

Mr. Franklin A. Wells, Director, Minneapolis Employment and Training Program, Minneapolis

Dr. Joan R. Wilkosz, Administrator of Vocational Education, Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis

APPENDIX E

Reaction to Report Recommendations

Minnesota Department of
Economic Security
Formerly the Department of Jobs and Training
390 North Robert Street • St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 296-8004 • TTY/TDD (612) 296-2796 • FAX (612) 296-5745
ommunity Based Services

July 12, 1995

Ms. Brenda M. Dillon, Executive Director
State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson St., Suite 314
St.Paul, MN 55101

Dear Ms. Dillon:

We appreciated the opportunity to work with you in the development of the biennial Perkins-JTPA evaluation. Our joint efforts were a clear indication of the continuation of the high degree of coordination between Perkins and JTPA programs. We have worked together to bring effective and efficient training services to our clients resulting in economic self-sufficiency.

It is with some surprise with which we read the first and fifth recommendations in Chapter Five of the biennial Perkins-JTPA evaluation. These recommendations are prescriptive and do not support the spirit of cooperation or of local decision making. Two areas which are critical to effective delivery of services. Specifically, we have the following comments to make about each of the two recommendations:

> Recommendation # 1: The location of Workforce Centers should be guided by local decisions. Minnesota's employment and training system has always been driven by respect for local decision making. Physical co-location of services is only one option for coordination. Attention should be paid to electronic co-location in the effort to achieve a no "wrong-door" approach to one-stop delivery of services. Technical colleges play an important role in the development of Minnesota's workforce. As such, technical colleges should serve as an access point for the local development center, just as local community action programs can.
>
> Recommendation #2: This recommendation generates numerous questions which must be addressed. In cases where SDAs split services, who is responsible for the outcomes? How can SDAs be assured of receiving base funding? How can the system avoid concurrent multiple enrollments? How can the system avoid wasteful competition, especially in the same labor market? What information will be available to clients enabling them to choose a SDA meeting their needs? How can SDAs plan and allocate dollars when they will not know their constituencies?

Ms. Brenda Dillon
July 12, 1995
Page Two

We urge you to reconsider these two recommendations in light of our concerns expressed above.

We want to continue our close relationship with Carl Perkins programs. Therefore, we are ready to assist you in formulating recommendations which enhance the spirit of cooperation and coordination.

Please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely,

Ginnee S. Engberg
Director, Employment and Training

GSE:dkl

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ASSOCIATION
MINNESOTA

July 11, 1995

Ms. Brenda Dillon
Executive Director
State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson Street, Suite 314
St. Paul, MN 55101

Dear Ms. Dillon:

I am writing to you on behalf of the seventeen Minnesota Service Delivery Areas. We are a locally based employment and training system accountable to local elected officials and private workforce Councils. Chip Wells from the City of Minneapolis, and Diane Bublitz from Private Industry Council Five, have reported some serious concerns regarding recommendations contained in your Perkins-JTPA Evaluation.

Recommendations One and Two both suggest that the Governor direct various State departments to "initiate a feasibility study on the co-location of staff and services. . . " and "initiate changes in departmental policies establishing cross-representation of agency staffs ..." This "top down" approach to coordination between JTPA and Perkins will not work at the local level. Local JTPA and Perkins providers will improve coordination because it makes sense locally--not because it is mandated by the State. The issue of co-location of JTPA Service Delivery Areas, technical colleges and secondary schools is not a decision to be made at the State level. As a matter of fact, much of the pending federal legislation on consolidating employment and training programs would prohibit such co-location. Local employment and training providers need to be "honest brokers" of classroom training. Co-locating the "honest brokers" on a vocational educational campus would make it very difficult to present training options with other classroom training providers. This recommendation also seems to presume that all activity by JTPA providers is related to vocational training when in fact this service is less than 50% of our activity.

Recommendation Five that U. S. Secretary of Labor modify rules and regulations allowing JTPA clients to choose which Service Delivery Area from which to receive services is indicative of the superficial nature of this evaluation. JTPA funds are allocated to Service Delivery Areas based on a formula that takes into consideration the number of unemployed and economically disadvantaged people that live in the areas. The need based formula concentrates resources where there is the greatest need. Allowing JTPA participants to choose which Service Delivery Area would provide service and would destroy the concept of allocating funds where they are needed most.

Ms. Dillon
July 11, 1995
Page 2

Unfortunately, neither the input of two of our Service Delivery Areas (PIC Five and Minneapolis) nor that of State from the Minnesota Department of Economic Security, have resulted in any substantial change in your original recommendations. In our opinion, your Council's Perkins-JTPA report represents a little more than a one-sided view on how the vocational technical education system would like to see coordination between JTPA and Perkins.

Sincerely,

Jerry Vitzthum, Chair
Operations Committee
Minnesota Job Training
Partnership Association

JV:yr
cc: R. Jane Brown, Commissioner
Mike Ryan

Dillon

Minnesota Department of
Economic Security
Formerly the Department of Jobs and Training
390 North Robert Street • St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 296-3711 • TTY/TDD (612) 282-5909 • FAX (612) 296-0994
Office of the Commissioner

July 12, 1995

Ms. Brenda M. Dillon, Executive Director
State Council on Vocational Technical Education
366 Jackson St., Suite 314
St. Paul, MN 55101

Dear Ms. Dillon:

Programs funded under the Carl Perkins Act and the Job Training Partnership Act have always been noted for a high degree of coördination. JTPA and Perkins Act program operators have cooperated to bring effective and efficient training services to our customers. This has enabled them to become economically and socially self-sufficient.

The first and fifth recommendations contained in Chapter Five of the biennial Perkins-JTPA evaluation do not represent this spirit of coordination. They are prescriptive in that they ask the Governor to direct certain state cabinet officials to initiate various feasibility studies. The recommendations do not support the concept of local decision making, a valuable component of the JTPA program in this state. We urge you to reconsider these recommendations in light of our concerns of maintaining flexibility and local control.

We continue to offer our assistance to you in formulating recommendations which foster and enhance the close relationship between Perkins and JTPA programs. Please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely,

Jane Brown

Jane Brown
Commissioner

RJB:dkl

REFERENCES

Beer, M. & Walton, A. E. (1989). Organization change and development. In W. L. French, C. H. Bell, Jr., & R. A. Zawacki (Eds.), *Organizational development: Theory, practice, and research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 58-78). Homewood, IL: BPI/Irwin.

Bentley, C. B., Christenson, L. G., & Mercer, J. W. (1991). *Perkins-JTPA evaluation: Analysis of adequacy, effectiveness, and coordination for the three years ending June 30, 1990*. St. Paul, MN: State Council on Vocational Technical Education.

Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-392, 104 Stat. 753 (1990).

Colopy, K. W., & Tarr, H. C. (1994). *Minnesota's public school choice options.* Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Dillon, B. M., Feickert, J. D.; Christenson, L. G., & Mercer, J. M. (1993). *Perkins-JTPA evaluation: Analysis of adequacy, effectiveness, and coordination for the two years ending June 30, 1992*. St. Paul, MN: State Council on Vocational Technical Education.

Funkhouser, J. E., & Colopy, K. W. (1994). *Minnesota's open enrollment option: Impacts on schools districts*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota. (1994). *Community transition interagency committees: 1994 summary*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

Job Training Partner Act, Pub. L. No. 97-300, 96 Stat. 1322 (1982).

Job Training Reform Amendments of 1992, Pub. L. No. 102-367, 106 Stat. 1021 (1992).

Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security. (1994, July). *State of Minnesota job training partnership act annual report: July 1, 1992 through June 30, 1993*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security. (in press). *State of Minnesota job training partnership act annual report: July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

Minnesota Department of Education (1995, March). *Minnesota education directory: 1994-1995*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

Patton, M. Q., Bringewatt, M. J., Campbell, J. L., Dewar, T. R., & Mueller, M. R. (1993, April). *The aid to families in poverty program: A synthesis of themes, patterns and lessons learned*. Minneapolis, MN: The McKnight Foundation.

Rubenstein, M. C., Hamar, R., & Adelman, N. E. (1992). *Minnesota's open enrollment option*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

State Board of Technical Colleges. (1992). *Minnesota state plan for vocational technical education: July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

State Board of Technical Colleges. (1993a). *Amendments to Minnesota state plan for vocational technical education: July 1, 1991 to June 30, 1992*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

State Board of Technical Colleges. (1993b). *State of Minnesota fiscal year 1993 performance report*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

State Board of Technical Colleges. (1993c). *Amendments to amendments of Minnesota state plan for vocational technical education: July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

State Board of Technical Colleges. (1994). *State of Minnesota fiscal year 1994 performance report*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

State Board of Technical Colleges. (1995). *Minnesota state plan for vocational technical education: July 1, 1994 to June 30, 1995*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

State Council on Vocational Technical Education. (1989, March). *Perkins-JTPA evaluation analysis of adequacy, effectiveness, and coordination*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

United States Department of Labor (1995, January). [National Evaluation of JTPA Title II Programs per Federal Standards]. Unpublished raw data.

The logo of the State Council on Vocational Technical Education is an abstract representation of the citizen-councilors assembled at a round table. Designed by a commercial art student at Alexandria Technical College, the design was selected in 1982 from 69 entries submitted by vocational students in Minnesota's high schools, secondary cooperative centers, and technical colleges. The Council made its selection on the basis of a recommendation by a panel of representatives from the graphic arts, public relations, and media industries in Minnesota.

Purpose of the Council

The State Council on Vocational Technical Education is designed to further public-private collaboration for the advancement of quality vocational programs responsive to labor market needs. Established in 1969 and designated as a state agency in 1985, the Council comprises 13 members appointed by the Governor. Seven members represent the private sector interests of agriculture, business, industry, and labor. Six of the members represent vocational technical education institutions, career guidance and counseling organizations, special education, and targeted populations.

The Council advises the Governor, the State Board of Technical Colleges, the State Board of Education, the Governor's Job Training Council, the business community, the general public, and the U.S. Secretaries of Education and Labor. The Council advises on development of the annual state vocational plan; provides consultation on the establishment of program evaluation criteria and state technical committees; analyzes the spending distribution and the availability of vocational programs, services, and activities; reports on the extent to which equity to quality programs is provided targeted populations; recommends procedures to enhance public participation in vocational technical education; recommends improvements that emphasize business and labor concerns; evaluates the delivery systems assisted under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); and advises on policies that the state should pursue to strengthen vocational technical education, as well as initiatives that the private sector could undertake to enhance program modernization.

To enhance effectiveness in gathering information, the Council holds at least one town meeting each year at which the public is encouraged to express its concern about vocational technical education in Minnesota. To enhance its effectiveness in providing information, the Council publishes a quarterly newsletter, an annual directory, and a biennial report. These publications as well as project and activity reports are available to the public.

Information on the date, time, and location of meetings and other activities is available by calling the Council Offices at 612/296-4202.

050790

366 Jackson Street, Suite 314, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
TEL: 612/296-4202 • FAX: 612/297-7786

An equal opportunity/affirmative action agency